239.4 Comp. Rel.
Class So. 2 Book
University of Chicago Library
GIVEN BY

Besides the main topic this book also treats of

Subject No.	*On page*	*Subject No.*	*On page*

So.

Theism Under Natural Law

As related to Old Testament Criticism,
and to the Theodicy of Lux Mundi

By

The REV. EDWARD SOFTLEY, B. D.

Author of "Modern Universalism and Materialism," Etc.

NEW YORK
THOMAS WHITTAKER
2 AND 3 BIBLE HOUSE

THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CHICAGO

BL2
.S68

Copyright, 1903
By EDWARD SOFTLEY

227410

To my beloved people,

All

To whom I have ministered in the bonds of the Gospel, especially to those whom God has given me as seals of my Ministry, this testimony to, and defense of His Holy Book is affectionately Dedicated.

Preface

THE object of the author has been, in this treatise, to present a chronologically consecutive epitome of the Elements of Theism; of their relation to each other, and to the structure of the Bible; and also to what is generally understood by Natural and Revealed Religion.

This has been the original and primary object, positively considered; but a secondary object of a negative character has been to place in contrast with the elements of Biblical Theism, and with Orthodox Christian Theology, that modern system of doctrine sometimes called the "New Theology," or "Higher Criticism," as set forth in "Lux Mundi." On both these subjects the author desires to say a few words.

In regard to the book now so well-known; the work of Bishop Gore and his co-essayists. It is the work of men who are graduates of the venerable University of Oxford, who occupy the position of Christian scholars, and who have the status of theologians and of clergymen of the Reformed Church of England! Alas! that Christianity and the historic and venerated church of our forefathers should be so scandalized! It may be deemed presumption for the writer thus to express himself, but, if so, it

is a presumption based upon a reasonable and a confident faith of "God's Word written"; and, because of this, he makes bold to express his conviction that their work is neither logically, nor Biblically, nor theologically defensible. On the contrary he would affirm his belief that the theology so elaborated will, in due time, be exploded as other heresies have been, and will have no honorable place in history. The names of such men as Augustine and Chrysostom, Usher and Jewel, Latimer and Cramner, Calvin and John Owen, together with Lightfoot and Westcott, Ryle and Spurgeon, as members of a noble host of masters of theology, and apologists for Christ and for Christianity, have an imperishable glory; a glory in which the authors of "Lux Mundi" can have no part nor inheritance.

With the same confidence may we affirm that the Bible will prove itself, as it has heretofore done, to be still the Book of God, and more than worthy of the absolute, entire and unfaltering faith of believing men.

The author desires further to say that his own study of this great subject has been, to him, the strong verification of such a confidence, and such as he cannot adequately express.

Under such conditions, the result thereof is now humbly offered for the acceptance, and candid consideration of all those to whom the Bible is,—yet,—"very pure," and very precious.

Contents

CHAPTER I

NATURAL THEOLOGY 1
God as Creator.—Intrinsic evidences from God's Works in Nature.—Relation of the Bible to Natural Theology.—Synopsis.

CHAPTER II

NATURAL RELIGION 21
God as Law-Giver, and Moral Governor.—A Moral Sequence from Objective Evidences.—Synopsis.

CHAPTER III

THE BEING OF GOD, AS RELATED TO HIS MORAL GOVERNMENT 44

CHAPTER IV

THE PROVIDENCE OF GOD, AS RELATED TO HIS MORAL GOVERNMENT AND TO THE PANTHEISTIC DOCTRINE OF IMMANENCE IN CREATION 60

CHAPTER V

THE CHURCH OF GOD, AS AN ELEMENT OF THEISM 81
Its Character and Origin.—A Moral Sequence from Man's Relation to God.—Moral Elimination.

CHAPTER VI

SACRED TRADITIONS, AS AN ELEMENT OF THEISM 103
Synopsis.

CHAPTER VII

PROPHECY AND THE PROPHETIC OFFICE 135

CHAPTER VIII

DREAMS, VISIONS AND REVELATIONS 150

CHAPTER IX

MIRACLES 174

CHAPTER X

THE LAW OF CONSCIENCE, AS AN ELEMENT OF THEISM . . . 197

APPENDIX.—NOTES

CHAPTER I

Note (*a*) Negative argument for the personality of God . . . 223
Note (*b*) Positive argument for the personality of God . . . 226
Note (*c*) Evolution and Elementary Theism 242
Note (*d*) Of faith in God 252

CHAPTER II

Note (*a*) Natural religion as a subjective result of objective evidences, and representing (1) duty to God, as taught, and (2) duty to God, as done under Natural Law 272
Note (*b*) Ontological argument 279
Note (*c*) Negative Argument for Monotheism 284
Note (*d*) Positive value of theistic evidences as addressed to a moral agent 291
Note (*e*) Of the knowledge of God 300

CHAPTER IV

Note (*a*) The Providence of God 310

CHAPTER VI

Note (*a*) Dr. de Costa, the Church of Rome, and "Lux Mundi" on Tradition 312

CHAPTER IX

Note (*a*) Theistic basis of the credibility of miracles . . . 320

CHAPTER X

Note (*a*) Analytical note on Conscience 324
Note (*b*) The essential elements of Theism always in evidence 327
Note (*c*) Moral obligation to seek God 332
Note (*d*) The Will as related to the Conscience 339
Note (*e*) Dr. Martineau on intuitional knowledge of God . . 348
Note (*f*) Force of Intuitional and Moral evidence, as stated by our Lord Jesus Christ 350
Note (*g*) Heathen ignorance, its cause and character 352

Theism Under Natural Law

CHAPTER I

NATURAL THEOLOGY

THE necessary basis and primary element of God's moral government of mankind is that of knowledge of His character and will. The revelation of God's character under natural law is so intimately connected with His being, that they may be said to be identified. For this reason, although we enter upon the consideration of God's moral government with the assumption that His being and personality are exempt from discussion and require neither proof nor argument, yet, the natural course and order to the due presentation of the elements on which His moral government depend must necessarily include some reference to the personality of God, as connected with the knowledge obtainable concerning Him in the works of Nature; or, from what is properly termed Natural Theology. In the term, Natural Theology, is comprehended all of objective nature, as witness for God. The appeal so made to man, whether in the evidence found in Creation itself, or,

as stated in Holy Writ, is an appeal to the obvious fact. It is also an appeal to the unaided senses, and to each of them. Further than this, it is an appeal to the collective and to the individual evidences; to the small and to the great, to the near and to the far off. While the obvious facts are evidence sufficient, and the unaided vision is a sufficient means of apprehension, we are invited to a closer and a minute inspection.

Our Lord points to a microscopic examination of the lilies of the field. God speaks to Job of the balancing of the clouds. Instances are to be found in Holy Writ, drawn from various parts of this wide and diversified field; these are but instances. If the direct references to Creation in the Bible are numerous, we may truly say that by indirect references and allusions, it is permeated and pervaded. Most of the manuals of Natural Theology are either occupied with a special aspect of the evidence, or contain but a partial survey of the whole. Dr. Paley says that in such a wide field it is natural that each will choose some particular section of the evidence, and that he, himself, has chosen that afforded by anatomy. Sir Wm. Dawson (Origin of the World, p. 24) strongly urges upon the clergy a closer study of nature, and laments a too general inattention amongst theological students to this subject. Dr. Dawson also quotes Baron Humboldt as saying that the general views of nature, contained in the Bible, or to which it tends, comprise, and in

fact anticipate, all that science is able to teach concerning it. As Biblical Theists we are required to base our estimate of the character and value of Natural Theology on the written and inspired Word. There we find that the written law corroborates the unwritten. Objective nature is regarded as mute, yet eloquent witness for God. In answer to the question, "Have they not heard?" the reply is "Yes, verily! their sound is gone forth into all lands, and their words to the end of the world" (Rom. 10:18). The works of God in nature are regarded in Holy Scripture as indubitable witness for Him. They are elementary lessons to mankind, as we teach children by object lessons. Addressed, as this evidence is, to responsible man, he is required to learn from it. As God's voice out of the whirlwind to Job (ch. 38) is an appeal to the evidence in objective nature, so also is the argument of Elihu (chs. 32–37). God does not, however, allow the sufficiency of the evidence to be a matter of argument; He visits the neglect of it as criminal. "Because they regard not the works of God, nor the operation of His hands, He will destroy them and not build them up" (Ps. 28:5). So also Isaiah 5:12, "The harp and the viol, the tabret and pipe and wine are in their feasts; but they regard not the work of the Lord, neither consider the operation of His hands." So his Providence and care in the ordering of His Creation is set forth in evidence for man to govern his life by; and man's reason is given, and is re-

garded by God as a light to guide him, as a moral agent, by the objective evidence of His works in Creation; and he is also expected and required to derive analogical knowledge of God, as a moral Governor, by observing and studying the manifest laws by which he governs the physical universe. So we learn from Isaiah 28: 23 ad finem: "Give ye ear and hear my voice; harken and hear my speech. Doth the plowman plough all day to sow? Doth he open and break the clods of his ground? When he doth make plain the face thereof doth he not cast abroad the fitches and scatter the cummin and cast in the principal wheat and the appointed barley and rye in their places? For his God doth instruct him to discretion, and doth teach him. For the fitches are not threshed with a threshing instrument, neither is a cart wheel turned about upon the cummin; but the fitches are beaten out with a staff, and the cummin with a rod. Bread corn is bruised because he will not ever be threshing it, nor break it with the wheel of his cart, nor bruise it with his horsemen. This also cometh forth from the Lord of Hosts, who is wise in counsel and excellent in working."

Man's refusal to consider such evidence is charged against him (Isaiah 1: 3).

By way of antithesis, it is characteristic of the righteous that they do, so reflect upon, and talks of God's wondrous works (Ps. 8: 9 and 19). The Psalmist says (Ps. 19: 1), "The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament sheweth His

handiwork." This is a rational as well as a scriptural statement. From the evidence so set forth we are open to choose whether we will accept as solution of the origin of the world, the speculative idea that claims philosophy in its support, and asserts that this vast universe by which we are surrounded, and the wondrous planet on which we dwell, came into their present state of order, and obedience to uniform laws, by a process of atomic development during an indefinite period, and which may, or may not leave room for the action of a Personal First Cause; or, whether being content with the moral axioms properly deducible from the evidence found in Creation itself, we will accept with a simple but rational faith the declaration with which the Bible opens its message to man; "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth" (Gen. 1 : 1). It may be true, as has been said, that evolution as a theory does not necessarily do away with design in Creation (or rather conflict with the evidence arising from design in Creation), for the existence and operation therein of a Personal First Cause, but only removes it farther back; it is sufficient, and apriori evidence against it that it does not harmonize either with Scripture evidence, as a whole, nor with its pervading characteristics: that is to say, with the supernatural, as its distinctive and peculiar feature; and it is only because clearly defined laws cannot, by any process of reasoning, be dissociated from a Personal Law

Giver, and because stress is laid by speculative philosophy upon the immanence of God in Creation, that this theory, which in the Theodicy of "Lux Mundi" is described as "the higher Pantheism," can with any shew of consistency be allowed a place in Biblical Theism. The name of Richard Hooker will be generally accepted by churchmen and theologians, and probably by all scholars, as a sufficient criterion of sound learning, piety and good theology, and it will be profitable here to compare his teaching on this subject with that of "Lux Mundi." He traces the foundation of Law, in its primary sense and original, to the Personality of God: this he terms, the First Law Eternal. The Second Law Eternal he finds in Creation, as the work of God's hands. In Creation He gave to everything, by His act and decree, an immutable and eternal law for its guidance and preservation. Thus, logically, as well as theologically, the supreme agent is, so to speak, directly seen in and by the laws by which Creation is governed, and by which it is sustained (Hooker, Eccl. Polity, Vol. 1., Book I, Chs. 3 and 4). The statement made by Hooker is in harmony with the Law Eternal peculiar to man: his reason,—given to him distinctively as the law or governing faculty of his life; it is also consonant with the principle of a Personal First Cause; it is in harmony with the experience which godly men have of a Personal Providence coming into direct and intimate contact

with the minutest details of their inner lives, and personal history as an actual fact; and, also, it is in harmony with all that Holy Scripture states in reference and testimony to the same, as a law and rule of God's government. The hypothesis of evolution is distinctly at variance with the aforesaid facts and experiences. In reference to Natural Theology, from the theistic and biblical standpoint, its primary aspect is the disclosure of the Divine attributes of Power, of Wisdom, of Love, of Steadfastness, or Eternity, and of Paternal Care. These attributes are displayed in His works: in the heavens above, and in the earth beneath, and in the waters under the earth, all that the eye of man can see, by natural vision or by artificial aid and instrumentality. In the language of Holy Scripture, at once natural, lifelike, beautiful and true: "All Thy works praise Thee, O Lord, and Thy saints give thanks unto Thee. They shew the glory of Thy Kingdom and talk of Thy power; that Thy power, Thy glory and the mightiness of Thy kingdom might be known unto men" (Ps. 145: 10, 11, 12). How often in Holy Writ do we find Jehovah, Himself, referring to His works as so declaring him; or His devout worshipers as meditating upon Him, and finding their hearts go out in holy adoration and worship to Him in such mediation! It is distinctly to be observed that if the authority of Holy Scripture is an acknowledged element in the evidence for Theism and for the Revelation of God

by His works, as Creator, then is it a paramount fact of Holy Writ in this connection, that the transcendence of God, as Creator, is clearly magnified in connection therewith, and His glorious personality asserted.

We are told, for instance, "From heaven did the Lord behold the earth that He might hear the mournings of such as are in captivity and deliver the children appointed unto death" (Ps. 102: 20). Of His Providence and Care, it is the general testimony of Holy Scripture that from heaven He stoops to superintend the affairs of men, and that He does so with the most intimate and pervasive sympathy, as well as efficacious knowledge and power. He instructed Moses to say to the Israelites that He had seen all the oppression from which they suffered at the hands of the Egyptians, and that He had "come down to deliver them." At the passage of the Red Sea, it was from the Pillar of Fire and of Cloud that He looked and troubled the host of the Egyptians. In the further prosecution of our enquiries as to the elements of God's moral government, we shall find abundant evidence confirmatory of the proposition laid down by Hooker that the foundation of all law in nature is the eternal law of God's own Being; and that, as supreme agent, He is seen not only in and by, but above and distinct from the works of nature, as transcendent in the distinctive glory of His own inherent perfection, set forth to men "at sundry

times and in divers manners," and that, mediately, or immediately, man, as His creature, is brought into responsible contact with the Divine supernatural as giving evidence to Him. Some instances from Holy Scripture may here be given in which the fundamental principle is stated, and the responsibility of man as connected with the knowledge of God as Creator is declared. St. Paul, in Rom. 1: 19, 20, says that "His eternal power and Godhead is so declared, and clearly seen." So Elihu uses the same evidence to convince Job; and Jehovah, Himself, ratifies the argument and enlarges upon it with majestic grandeur and beauty (Job, chs. 38–42). St. Paul from Mars Hill spoke to the Athenians of Him who "hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed and the bounds of their habitation" (Acts 17: 26). Paul and Barnabas, at Lystra, spoke of the "Living God who in times past suffered all nations to walk in their own ways; nevertheless, He left not Himself without witness, in that He did good, and sent us rain from heaven and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness" (Acts 14: 16, 17). Our blessed Lord has most clearly and fully restated the same evidence in His Sermon on the Mount, and upon other occasions; inculcating upon us the lesson of faith in God, from His care of the fowls of the air, and from the beauty of the lilies of the

field, and from the fact that His goodness is seen in causing His sun to shine on the evil and on the good, and in sending rain upon the just and on the unjust. We may summarize the evidence by saying that from whatever part of God's universe we regard Him in evidence, also whether it be in the display of power and majesty, in wisdom and skill, in constancy and stability, in order and harmony, in beauty, or, in love, and beneficence; we see the properties of a Personal Agent, and in the unity to be traced all through His works, we clearly can, and justly should, from the evidence conclude that it is one, and complete in His wondrous Personality. As Theists we maintain that the world is its own witness to a personal Creator. As Biblical Theists we maintain that the works of creation and the Word of God exhibit unity of origin; that they exhibit unity of design; both severally, and as related to each other, and they are homogeneous in character. But I have a further and a more important point to make in regard to Natural Theology, or, the Works of God in nature, as related to the Bible. As an organic and structural unit, the Bible, as a whole, exhibits evidence that it is based upon the primary and axiomatic fact of a Personal First Cause, as Creator and Governor of the world. So far from the rudimentary and initial evidence, as found in the Cosmos, being anywise doubtful, or deficient as to this rudimentary and necessary truth, we are

justified in affirming that subsequent historical and inspired revelations of God in Holy Scripture, while they are in their several parts a progressive and cumulatory revelation of God, are also, largely, amplifications and reassertions of the initial evidence of Creation and Conservation. They are, as cumulative and progressive evidence, based upon natural law, and a personal lawgiver, as so exhibited. These primary and essential evidences for God are continuously ratified and reasserted by the writers of the Old Testament, including the prophets and the authors of the Hagiographa; they are most fully ratified in the teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ, as they are also implied and acknowledged in the books of the New Testament. It is also to be noticed that throughout the Holy Scriptures this natural evidence is not only reproduced as a memorial for God, and as a first principle of Theism, but it is charged against men with superadded sanctions. As a principle of God's government, distinctive in character, and as a fundamental truth concerning human accountability, it is asserted by St. Paul in the epistle to the Romans; and while it is there explicitly taught, in various other places it is taught by implication. As an illustration of such general principle permeating Holy Scripture, I will here refer to the instances of Nebuchadnezzar, and of his son Belshazzar. In categorical terms Belshazzar is charged with not glorifying God, as the known author of his being.

"The God in whose hand thy breath is, and whose are all thy ways, thou hast not glorified" (Dan. 5 : 23). The same charge that is laid by St. Paul against the heathen world in Rom. 1 : 20, 21. It is to be noticed that in the case of Nebuchadnezzar the same charge is made positive. He is charged with exalting himself against God, whom he knew to be the source of the power he exercised and the glory that he possessed. The Lord Jehovah here declares Himself as Supreme Governor, and that the kings and people of the earth are responsible to Him under natural law; and that they are under the obligation of glorifying Him as Creator and as moral Governor. We find elsewhere, as in Job 34 : 27, that the charge and condemnation is laid against men of "refusing to consider any of His ways," or, as David says (Ps. 14 : 2), "enquire after God."

To prove all the evidences to this fact by direct or indirect reference would be to transcribe no small portion of the Old and New Testaments. It is also to be observed that, as man, himself, is "within the unity of nature," and that as to him that evidence is specially presented, as he is also specially capacitated ontologically and morally to receive it, so, the teaching of natural law is appealed to, as it is asserted both without and around him, and also as a law within himself (Job 40 : 15–24). We are directed to the consideration of God's attributes as displayed in Creation, both to remind us of our

dependence upon Him, and to comfort and assure us in that dependence. We are reminded of His character as the Eternally Righteous One to establish us in the work of righteousness, and to patient continuance in well doing by the consideration that He is a "faithful Creator" (1 Pet. 4 : 19).[1]

Further than this, not only are we instructed to know and to believe that the Bible, as an organic whole, is based upon the abstract fact of God, as Creator and Governor, but we also find that subsequent books of the Bible consolidate and ratify the historical and initial evidence given in the Book of Genesis to the concrete fact, and circumstantial evidence therein given of such creation, and of its subsequent results and consequences. Not only do we find that the subsequent books of the Bible are organically united with the book of Genesis, and

[1] I will, here, quote a passage from the book of Job, which may be said to contain the gist of the argument from a Theistic and Biblical standpoint, for Natural Theology.

"But ask now the beasts and they will teach thee ; and the fowls of the air, and they shall tell thee ; or speak to the earth, and it shall teach thee ; and the fishes of the sea shall declare to thee. Who knoweth not in all these that the hand of the Lord hath wrought this. In whose hand is the soul of every living thing, and the breath of all mankind" (Job 12 : 7, 8, 9, 10). The inference deducible from this passage, as, also, from the whole scope of scripture teaching is this : As objective evidence, addressed to man, creation is, in itself, unequivocal evidence of, and testimony to God, as perfect First Cause, and Creator, and man cannot without criminality, in his relation to God, separate between Him and the works of His hands, in the relation of cause and effect.

the inspired record of creation; but they are, as parts of the organic structure, based upon the inspired record of creation, and also upon the record of the Fall of Man; and that such record is consolidated by cumulative and homogeneous evidence, in Law, in Prophecy and in History; and such testimony is perfected and finally sealed by the authoritative, and explicit teaching and testimony of our Lord Jesus Christ. It is sufficient here to observe that these considerations are vital to us. They are primary, and also eternal principles of God's moral government. As they were, by Job, and his friends accepted as familiar and axiomatic, as well as necessary truths, they are, as such, endorsed and reasserted, both in their relation to God as Creator and Father, and also to the inspired record of the Old and New Testaments, as God's handiwork; and to the Bible, as a whole, by Him whose authority and testimony may not be disputed without peril. As He has declared that upon love to God, and love to man, as essential principles, are based "all the Law and the Prophets," so also may we be justified by His teaching in declaring that with regard to Natural Religion, and the Word of God, the attributes and character of God and the ontological and moral faculties of man with which God as Creator has endowed him, are the salient features of His moral government, and the basis of all subsequent revelations of the Divine Will concerning us, and the governing factors by which they are directed.

The prophetical teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ in regard to Natural Theology.

I have hereinbefore but incidentally quoted the teaching of our Lord and Saviour in regard to God as Creator, and in regard to Natural Theology. I desire now, in closing this summary, to make it a special point in the argument, and as the subject stands related to Christ and to Christianity. In view of the fact that, in the theodicy of "Lux Mundi," the Incarnation is the *terminus a quo*, or starting point of dogmatic Theism, the ascertained facts of our Lord's teaching in regard to natural evidences is of peculiar importance. The question is, What are these facts? The answer afforded to us in the Gospel is, that God's works and character as evidenced in Creation, and Conservation, are brought forth as specific and distinctive elements of truth concerning His character and moral government; that, as such, they are directly appealed to; and, also, that as such evidence, they are incorporated with His own personal and prophetic teaching in regard to the character and objects of Christian faith, and the subject of Christian duty. This is evidenced throughout all the recorded teaching of our Lord. It is made prominent in a special manner by His Sermon on the Mount. The love, wisdom and care of God is the great theme, and the basis of every precept. God cares for the ravens; He clothes the lilies of the field; He causes His sun to rise on the evil and on the good; He sends rain

on the just and on the unjust. The love, even of our enemies, is inculcated upon us by the fact that our Father in Heaven is kind unto the unthankful, and to the evil. We are exhorted to kindness and unselfish benevolence by the fact that He is the great and universal Giver; our duty, in short, as disciples of Christ, is here set before us and inculcated on the broad and primary basis of the personality and character of God.

Synopsis of Chapter I[1]

It will, I think, be useful, having considered the evidence, negative and positive for Natural Theology, or in other words, for the being and personality of God as Creator and Author of the world we live in, and of the universe at large, to summarize the conclusion deducible from the evidence, as a basal truth, and as that on which we may properly build the primary and initial truth of the theistic argument.

There have been, in all ages, those who have disbelieved, or affected to disbelieve, the primary and rudimentary truth of the existence and being of God as declared and set forth to us in Holy Scripture.

[1] As integral parts of a consecutive argument, it is desirable that the *Notes* to the several Chapters, placed in the Appendix, should be read in their proper order and relation to the Chapters to which they belong.

It may be said to be characteristic of and peculiar to the disbelief of the present day as declared by its teachers, that it is a disbelief of the natural evidence, and professedly on grounds of science, or the ascertained fact of natural law. Moreover, it is further characteristic of such disbelief in the present age, that it, now, comes to us from within the professing church of God, and of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; and that a Theodicy is built upon this basis; primarily upon what is asserted to be a basis of scientific truth, or the ascertained facts of natural law. Such is the character of the Theodicy of "Lux Mundi." Its authors plainly and unmistakably state and declare that it is built upon evolution. Were their premise supported by the logic of fact, as they would have us believe it to be, we should then be justified in saying that the primary and initial truth of Theism—*i. e.*, the being and personality of God as First Cause and Creator—were overthrown and made void, in the first place, by the evidence and teaching of natural law; and, consequently, that the claims and evidence of the law supernatural were also made void and of none effect, nay that it were a fabrication, and a superstitious delusion,—at the least.

Without in this place remarking upon the logical, Biblical and theological results, in detail, it is sufficient, now, synoptically to declare the conclusions deduced, and I think logically deduced from all the evidence, that the claim so made, in the name of

science and of natural law, is not verified and supported thereby; that the theory of cosmical evolution, however held, is not entitled to claim the ascertained facts and principles of science as its ground and original; and that such has been asserted in the name and in the authority of science, by those who are entitled to speak on its behalf.

Having noticed this fact, I shall in epitomizing the results of all the evidence proceed to say, first, that the actual results obtained from the study of nature by capable specialists, has resulted in the fully sufficient and satisfactory proof of the operations and character of a supreme and perfect First Cause; I say that such results are obtained from the works of nature, themselves, intrinsically considered, as affording such evidence, or, by a subjective and analytical examination; but in conjunction with and fortified by consideration of our own ontological qualities and character as those to whom such evidence is presented of God; and as man is shown therein, himself, to be within the unity of nature.

Objective nature, as related to, and inclusive of man, we may consider the complementum of natural evidence to God as Creator, and as Moral Governor of the universe. This evidence for God, intrinsically considered, is a sufficient witness to the fact, as it is the universal, and also the minimum of evidence ordained of God, in the order and conditions of His moral government.

The next point I have to make is this; Natural evidence, so described, to God, as Creator and Moral Governor of the world, is fortified by, and unified with the testimony of His inspired Word to the same primary fact. It may correctly and truly be said that the primary, as well as the initial truth of Holy Scripture, is that fundamental truth which underlies it all, and on which it is based; the opening declaration in the Bible, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the Earth" (Gen. 1 : 1).

I shall not amplify, but simply state the fact that the several books of the Bible, in their chronological order, successively iterate, and reiterate, with progressive and cumulative testimony this initial truth, with which every successive truth is unified, and upon which it is built, the sublime and glorious truth of the character and personality of God, as First Cause, and as Chief-good, and as the Universal Father of His creatures.

Let it be understood, and observed that herein there is no evolutionary progress, by which previous elements of truth are superseded and abrogated, but a progressive, cumulative and culminatory revelation to man, upon this basis, and unified with, as expletive of the great primary and essential verity of the Eternity, Personality and Fatherhood of God.

The last point I wish to make, in this synopsis, is this: That Holy Scripture, in its entirety, is the

complementum of all evidence and testimony to the existence, character and will of God in His relation as Creator, Moral Governor and Redeemer of men; and that it is a Divine summary of the history of mankind and of God's dealings with him, as well as of all necessary truths concerning God Himself. I shall merely state, and repudiate the assertion that the books of the Old Testament are to be regarded as Jewish literature. This fallacious statement is the minor premise of the rationalistic criticism, but it has its root and origin in that aversion to the Divine supernatural characteristic of man, as he is a sinner and fallen from God. The Bible is the book of God as related to man, and it is so fully and completely one book that it includes and is unified with the book of nature, as it is itself the Divine unification of all evidences, including all and singular of those supra-natural revelations which it has pleased God to make of Himself to mankind.

CHAPTER II

NATURAL RELIGION

It may suffice to say that the term Natural Religion is herein used as describing subjective Theism, and as the result of, or associated with Theistic evidence in nature, or Natural Theology.

It is to be noted here also that these elements of Theism, objective and subjective, are permanent elements, always to be accounted of in historic Theism and in the estimate of human privilege and accountability, as they are consolidated and incorporated as such in Holy Scripture. The importance to be attached to this fact will be more evident hereafter; it is sufficient, here, to refer to the fact as it is connected with the great principle of a law eternal, having its origin in the being and personality of God.

In Natural Theology we view God's attributes and character as displayed in His works; in Natural Religion we contemplate Him as a Lawgiver; and also, the subjective and internal operation of His moral law.

The laws of physical nature supply an analogical argument for the fact of His moral government, as also for that of His existence and personality. Such

analogical argument is, I conceive, to be regarded as accessory to more direct and specific evidence and proof; this specific evidence is to be found in those moral axioms of subjective truth clearly deduced from the personality of God, as declared and set forth in creation itself—or, in Natural Theology. We have seen that the being and nature of God, as the perfect intelligence, is the inherent and underived law of His operations; also, that from the inherent and eternal law of God's being, a second and a derived law-eternal, is found in the works of His creation. We have, now, to notice the law of man's nature, peculiar to him, as man, which God has imparted to him in creation, as the governing law for the regulation of his life. This law is the faculty of understanding and knowledge,—or reason, as it is peculiar to the human soul. It is an ontological and psychical quality; and a primary part of those moral faculties by which man is made a fitting subject of God's moral government, as it is coupled with a capacity for free-agency, in connection with a determinating faculty, or will. Man, as the Creator's handiwork, and ontologically considered, apart from the controlling bias of predominating good, or, morally considered, does so partake of God's image. There is great significance in the inspired declaration that God "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." This is the normal and distinctive faculty peculiar to man, as it is divinely bestowed. This,

it is the duty of the responsible creature to follow and obey, as the law of his life, ordained of God.

By the gift of a rational soul, man has been ontologically and generically separated by his Creator from the brute creation; and we may say that his lordship over them, given him by God, has been so constituted.

From the premises before established as to the source and origin and to the character of this law, peculiar to man, as ontologically related to God as Creator, it is, as stated by Hooker, justly considered that the following moral axioms of subjective knowledge, by the evidence in nature, may be clearly drawn.

1st. That the human understanding, or law of reason, teaches adoration of the Supreme Being, as it acknowledges Him as known.

2d. That the principle of Right as proceeding from Him is universally acknowledged.

3d. As a further consequence, it is a universally acknowledged duty, peculiar to man, as man, to do as he would be done by.

The foregoing are the primary moral axioms which, as Hooker says "The mind even of mere natural men have attained to know," and universally accepted as duty.

He calls them "grand mandates," in contradistinction from other moral duties, so knowable, and he shews that they, in substance, contain the two great commandments which our Divine Lord

declares to be "all the Law and the Prophets" (Hooker, Eccles. Pol., Book II, Ch. 8).

I regard Hooker's arguments, which I have epitomized, as a thoroughly logical statement of the elements of Theism; and his statements are supported by ample evidence from Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, together with Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, and others; his own great name, however, is sufficient evidence and guarantee.

I subjoin a few additional remarks simply to summarize the argument, and to trace its connections. Hooker, by a process of inductive reasoning, from effect to cause, shows that the universality of the evidence, on a fundamental matter of moral obligation, could only obtain the agreement indicated in the axioms before mentioned, by emanation from Him who made all men; and that such result is mediately obtained, first, because of the universality of the objective evidence in the works of nature, and, second, because of the identity of moral constitution in man; and because of the reasoning faculty, peculiar to man (ontologically considered) and given to him as the governing law of his life.

I will now add some evidence from Holy Scripture as the corroborative law by which truth is, finally, to be tested.

First in order, it will be proper to corroborate our principle as to the first Law Eternal, by this rule. In Psalm 25: 8, we read, "Good and upright is the

Lord; therefore will He teach sinners in the way." So, Psalm 11: 7, "The righteous Lord loveth righteousness, His countenance will behold the upright." So, Isaiah 26: 7, "Thou most upright dost weigh the path of the just." So, Solomon in Prov. 14: 2 says, "He that walketh in his uprightness feareth the Lord; but he that is perverse in his ways despiseth Him."

I have made no special selection of the above; they do but indicate the general tenor of the testimony.

Noticing, first, the necessary inference derivable from the last clause of the last passage quoted, viz., that the Lord Jehovah, as the fountain or source of Law, is essentially upright, I will add a quotation from the grand Song of Moses in Deut. 32: 4, "He is the rock, His work is perfect; a God of truth and without iniquity, just and right is He." This may suffice. "Just" or "Right" does but express what we, in our idiom, can but express by "perfect" or "good," as applied to moral and personal qualities; but expressed by Greek writers, as Hooker says, "most divinely" by one word, combining the ideas of beauty and of goodness, viz., Kalokagathia (*καλοκαγαθια*). In reference to the Divine personality, we may add that the moral intuition which all men may be said to have of His essential being and character, is that of absolute moral perfection; the Eternal Right. This is expressed by Faber when he says,

"For Right is right, as God is God,
And Right the day must win;
To doubt would be disloyalty,
To falter would be sin."

Confirmatory of the fact that rectitude may properly define the essential being of the Most High, I will notice that it is evident in all of Holy Scripture that the law of rectitude is that by which He has always proved men, by which He has accepted them,—and, upon which all the hope and confidence of His true worshipers have been based and grounded, as it has constituted the great plea of their petitions for acceptance at His hands. Thus, David pleads in Psalm 26: 1–3, "Judge me O Lord, for, I have walked in mine integrity." Such was the plea of Abimelech, King of Gerar, "In the integrity of my heart and in the innocency of my hands have I done this;" and so, God accepted him (Gen. 20: 5, 6). Such was God's charge to Abraham, "I am the Almighty God; walk before me and be thou perfect,"—*i. e.*, upright (Gen. 17: 1). Such was Abraham's great plea when pleading for Sodom, "Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?" Such, too, was the character given of Enoch, of Noah, and of Job.

It is proper and necessary, now, to substantiate the argument for the "second law eternal," as stated by Hooker. St. Paul says, in Rom. 1: 21, of the heathen nations or ἔθνοι, that "When they knew God, they glorified Him not, as God, neither were

thankful,—but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened; professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God to an image made like unto corruptible man." Further than this, "they changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshiped and served the creature more than (*i. e.*, in preference to) the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen." In Rom. 2: 14, St. Paul speaks of those who, living under the law of nature, were a law unto themselves, while not having the law, written and revealed. Such, he says, "Shew the work of the Law, written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts, the meanwhile accusing, or else excusing one another." Hooker refers to the above passage in connection with John 1: 7, 8, 9, which speaks of Christ as "The true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world."

Both of the foregoing passages may be read in connection with the remarkable utterance of our Divine Lord, Himself, in Luke 12: 54–58, where He says, "O ye hypocrites! ye can discern the face of the sky, and of the earth, and, how is it that ye do not discern this time?" There may be no doubt that our Lord is, here, referring to the era of time, as related to God's moral government, which the historic facts of that government had progressively disclosed;—and, especially,—as related to the Gospel era, and to Himself. St. Paul refers to the fact that

God had "determined the times before appointed," as well as "the bounds of the habitation," of different races of men (Acts 17: 24–28).

Another remarkable expression we find in Holy Scripture, with a cognate reference; *i. e.*, "This Way" and "That Way." Thus in Acts 22: 4, St. Paul says, "I persecuted this way unto the death," "binding and delivering into prisons both men and women." So, in Acts 19: 23, we read, "And at the same time there arose no small stir about that way." The reference in both the above passages (specifically in the latter) is to the doctrines of Christianity.

In Acts 5: 20, we find reference to Christianity in its subjective aspect; or, the manner of life and distinctive character that it produces. The Angel of the Lord, by night, opened the prison doors, and brought them out, and said, "Go stand and speak in the temple, to the people all the words of this life." So, Christ is said, distinctively, to be the life of His people. "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with Him in glory" (Col. 3: 4). Collectively, all these passages stand related, and have reference to the times of Christ, the way of His salvation, and the life that characterizes His people, as the result of belief in Him. So also, with reference to the words of our Lord before quoted (*i. e.*, Luke 12: 54–58) must we understand Him to mean as referring to the fact of their having natural means of knowledge of

God, and of Himself, as well as a reference to the Old Testament scriptures in such relation; but, yet more significant are the words that follow, "Yea, and why even of yourselves, judge ye not what is right?"

The analogy, closing this discourse, ratifies the interpretation I have given. Evidently, our Lord here sets the seal of His authority to the principle deduced from the works of nature, and ratified by His holy Word, as to the law of reason being the first publication to man of the Divine Law for the government of his life and actions; and, of its being sufficient to hold him accountable therefor.

So also in the forty-fifth chapter of the Prophecy of Isaiah, Jehovah's words to Cyrus, the Persian monarch, may be regarded as strictly pertinent to the case of heathendom, and to means, by the law of nature, of knowledge of God. "For, thus saith the Lord that created the heavens; God, Himself, that formed the earth and established it, He created it not in vain, He formed it to be inhabited, I am the Lord, and there is none else. I have not spoken in secret, in a dark place of the earth; I said not to any of the seed of Jacob, Seek ye My face in vain; I the Lord (*i. e.*, Jehovah) speak righteousness, I declare things that are right." Here Jehovah expressly declares Himself as the fountain of moral law. The law of His own being and also that of the second law-eternal,—given to man as the law of a rational soul, is the law of Right.

"The way of the just is uprightness; Thou, most upright, dost weigh the path of the just" (Isaiah 26 : 7). I quote this passage a second time, because it connects the first, and the second law-eternal, as stated by Hooker.

That is to say, those who are, in Holy Scripture termed "His workmanship," with His being and character who is master-workman, and First Cause. In thus ascertaining and demonstrating that the eternal law of God's being is the law of Right, and that such is the law, primary and fundamental, that He has given to man as the special law for the government of his life, we have reached a most important conclusion as to the basis of God's moral government,—considered as a whole, and in reference to the several parts thereof; and, we may properly be impressed with the primary fact, that God has in no age, and in no part of the world, left Himself without witness as to His character and to the law that should govern man's life in relation to his Creator, and in relation to his fellow-man; and, also, that God is "the rewarder of all them that diligently seek Him." The question of evidence is simply a question of measure and degree, and not a question as to the fact, itself. The popular idea in regard to heathen nations, in the past, and in the present, as well as the premises of the speculative theological philosophy of the day, is based upon fallacy, as to the abstract argument, as well as upon a false inference as to the position of Holy

Scripture in relation to Natural Theology, and to Natural Religion. It is quite evident to the thoughtful observer, that in the present day, as in former ages, the predominating power governing human life is not the law of the understanding, but that of the determinating faculty, or will, as it is controlled, either by the natural appetite and the evil affections of our moral nature on the one hand, or by the renewed and regenerated affections which are the result of a Divine work upon the soul, on the other. Sin and holiness, as moral qualities, are the same in all ages; and so of the objective evidence for Theism, in its primary and essential character. The revelation of "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God, in the face of Jesus Christ" does but bring out in the clearest manner both the glory of His Divine character, and the exceeding sinfulness of sin. "This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved; but he that doeth truth cometh to the light that his deeds may be made manifest that they are wrought in God" (John 2: 19, 20, 21). "If I had not come and spoken to them, they had not had sin; but, now, they have no cloke for their sin" (John 15: 22).

This passage refers, not to the fact, merely, but to the degree of sin. To trace the generic character

of acceptable obedience, as a uniform principle, it is found in faith. "He that is of God heareth God's words; ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God" (John 8: 47). Again, "We are of God; he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God heareth not us. Hereby know we the spirit of truth and the spirit of error" (1 John 4: 6). Our Lord, Himself, claimed man's obedience because He was sent of God.

His Messianic character and claims, viewed from the standpoint of His personality as Immanuel, embodied the same principle. "We have seen (says the beloved disciple) and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world" (1 John 4: 14).

Having now, as I consider, sufficiently established the primary principle of God's moral government as to evidence under natural law, and as such law stands related, not only to its character, but to its sufficiency to hold man responsible to his Creator; and as such evidence applies anterior to an inspired law, and Lawgiver; I shall leave the consideration of the consequent responsibility, or the question of conscience, and free-agency, as related thereto, until I have considered some other subjects, as important elements of Theistic knowledge, anterior to inspiration.

Before doing so I desire to state Hooker's answer to the objection, "How do you account for the fact that, although the greatest part of the law moral,

being so easy for all men to know, so many thousands of men, notwithstanding, have been ignorant even of principal moral duties, not imagining the breach of them to be sin?" Hooker says, "I deny not but that lewd and wicked custom, beginning at first, perhaps among a few, afterwards spreading into greater multitudes, and, so continuing, from time to time, may be of force, even in plain things, to smother the light of natural understanding." In short, such is traceable to vicious habit and custom. Man does not know God simply because he does not want to know Him. This is true, individually considered; and it needs little argument to state the degree of power attending popularity. It is the idol that most men, as they are "of the world," bow down unto.

In reference to the individual aspect of the matter, we read in Psalm 14: 2, "God looked down from Heaven upon the children of men to see if there were any that would understand and seek after God;" and in reference to the latter aspect, or to communities of men, there was a command given by Moses, to the Israelites, specially directed against the power of the multitude. (Exodus 13: 2) "Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil." So, also, our Lord says that many go in the broad way, because it is broad, and few go in at the strait gait and walk in the narrow way, because it is strait, and the way is narrow (Matt. 7: 13, 14).

This too is a fundamental and universal principle

of Theism, applicable in all ages, in all localities, and under widely different degrees of light, and of religious privilege. Hence we arrive at the moral as well as the Scripture solution of the inherent character of sin. It is "the transgression of the law." As it is the act of a rational being, it cannot be done involuntarily; it must be done willingly. So, St. Peter says, "This they willingly are ignorant of." And, because it is the act of the will,—the final action taken by the moral agent upon evidence,—the law of reason, the law given to guide him, is transgressed; and, in violating the law of his nature, given him of God as the guide of his actions, he commits an act that brings him under the law of moral accountability. "To him that knoweth to do good and doeth it not, to him it is sin" (James 4: 17). The negative, here, as always, involves the positive. The same principle holds good whether the act is done under natural, or under supernatural and inspired law. It is necessary, in the next place, to state an important principle equally fundamental to Theism, which is this; that man cannot, under any circumstances, as cannot any created being, by any possibility, be independent of God, as First Cause. Hooker guards his statements as to the law-eternal of man's nature, by stating this fact in the most emphatic terms (Book II, ch. 9: 1). "There is no kind of faculty or power in man, or in any other creature, which can rightly perform the functions allotted to it, without the perpetual aid and

concurrence of that supreme cause of all things." That is to say, without supernatural help, or in other words, without the assistance of God's Holy Spirit. Without extending the consideration of this general principle beyond our race, or beyond our present condition as having fallen from God and holiness; that is to say, from a state of provisional innocency, as was the case with our first parents; because we have become heirs of a distinctly sinful nature, or a natural bias to sin, which Holy Scripture and also facts declare to be of a radically malignant as well of a decided character; we are absolutely dependent upon the direct, personal and supernatural grace of God's Holy Spirit, promised to us in Holy Scripture, and always given to the true seeker after God in obedience to the law of Right.

To such, aid has, without doubt, ever been given; and Holy Scripture does but establish an elementary principle of Theism under Natural Law, when it emphasizes, as it does fully, both in the Old and the New Testaments, such a quality and characteristic as distinguishing God's people. They are described as "followers after righteousness, and seekers of the Lord" (Is. 53: 1). So our Lord voices this principle when He says, "Ask and it shall be given you, seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened unto you, for every one that asketh receiveth, and he that seeketh findeth, and to him that knocketh it shall be opened" (Matt. 7: 7, 8). Fur-

ther, be it considered that, if man, as a sinner, is incapable of redeeming himself, by reason of the moral power of sin over his heart, or of obeying, without supernatural aid, the law of Right, still less is he able, as a finite creature, intellectually to find out God, or to fathom the Infinite Mind; and, least of all, as a sinner, to have communion, whether by knowledge or by any other moral and spiritual quality, with Him. Only those who, as sinners, humble themselves before God, can be so exalted; and as our Lord has so declared and testified, so also has He said, "If any man receive not the Kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in no-wise enter therein" (Mark 10: 15). Of this principle, as well as of the former, it may be affirmed, both are fundamental principles of God's moral government; they have obtained from the beginning, and they obtain now, as eternal principles of His moral law; and, as such, are incapable of modification or change; they remain fixed, whatever may be the time, manner or degree of Theistic evidence in its progressive manifestation, consolidation and ultimate development. The method, or plan, of man's recovery, as a fallen being, could, on theistic premises, be evolved or disclosed to man in no other way than by a direct or supernatural disclosure from Jehovah Himself. But, such disclosure is quite independent of the fact, itself, which, as an act of the Divine Mind, is the effect of His eternal counsel; and the gradational disclosure of such

purpose as is embodied in Holy Writ is the alone development possible, or consistent with Biblical Theism.

Of the radical and essential distinction between philosophical and Theistic knowledge, I will discourse hereafter. I do but desire here to emphasize the fact that no real or supposed discoveries or developments of scientific knowledge (the premises of the Divine existence, and personality being granted, as established facts) can, by any possibility, affect the first law-eternal of God's being, or nature, as it is identified with His self-existence and eternity; and, from this it follows that His counsels for the moral government of mankind are one and unchangeable, and they apply, not merely from the foundation of the world, but were an eternal purpose of the Infinite. (Rev. 13 : 8), "The Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." (Eph. 3 : 11), "The eternal purpose, which He purposed in Christ Jesus, our Lord." Otherwise the theory of evolution as applied to theology by the authors of "Lux Mundi" becomes no less than a radical issue with Biblical Theism in its origin, character and results.

From these preliminary considerations it may be evident that objective and subjective theism must necessarily have one uniform character, as it has existed and obtained in the several ages of the world's history, and under a Divine economy of grace and probation. In other words, although "God spake at sundry times, and in divers manners,

in times past, to the fathers, by the prophets, and has, in these last days, spoken to us by His Son," this fact in nowise affects the unity of God's law of procedure, or the elements of Biblical Theism, in doctrine, fact or history.

God's method of salvation, as His purpose, is one and eternally the same, and absolutely incapable of mutation or change; primarily by reason of His own being or nature, and subordinately, or derivatively because of the moral qualities with which He has endowed us.

I close these considerations of the evidence for Natural Religion as an element in the moral government of God by remarking that the primary, fundamental law of reason, as the second law-eternal peculiar to man, as created; as it is divinely given, does, in itself, comprehend a prospect and an expectation of additional evidence from the supreme and inexhaustible source of all things, and of all intelligences; not from within itself, but from the Creator as the great giver, and the supreme intelligence and the perfect good.

We may regard the principle enunciated by our Blessed Lord, as the great Prophet and Teacher of supernatural truth (as He is also, in His person, "the image of the invisible God," and "head over all things to the Church") as expressive of a truth fundamental to Theism and to Natural Religion, when He teaches us that "To him that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance"; that is to

say, that to "the generation of them that seek Him"; to the church, in its proper, normal and essential character, as a community of spiritual worshipers; to such, individually, in hope, and to such, as a spiritual and chosen generation did, from the beginning, properly appertain the reasonable expectation of cumulative manifestations and revelations of God, as also of ever increasing experiences as facts, in evidence, in support of their faith and hope, as fixed on Him. Lastly, and with special reference to "Lux Mundi," I would say that Natural Religion and elementary Theism is counter, in its essential character to the New Theology therein set forth upon the basis of cosmical evolution; as such theory is counter to the Divine personality, and, so, to Biblical Theism; while, on the other hand, Natural Religion, as representing elementary Theism, may be said to require, as also to expect, a written and Divine law-supernatural, in development of God's purposes of eternal salvation, as well as of the principles of His moral government; as such development is in perfect consonance with Theism, as grounded upon the fact of the Divine Personality, and essential being of God, and also upon man's actual need, ontologically and morally considered, to receive from Him; and, specially does this apply to those who, as His true worshipers, in the ages antecedent to the Mosaic and New Testament eras, have longed for and earnestly desired such communications from Him,

as they have desired conformity to His character. Such, in all ages of the world, are not only heirs of a just and reasonable "expectation," by reason of His nature and personality in whom they put their trust; but they are also the heirs, as they are the subjects, of His recorded and peculiar promises.

Synopsis of Chapter II

Our first proposition under this head is, that God, as revealed in nature, is knowable. This proposition is the logical sequence of our conclusions from Chapter I. We have concluded that nature, intrinsically considered, reveals God, and we have also seen that this conclusion is ratified by Holy Scripture, and is in unison with it. I will somewhat amplify and particularize these general conclusions. We have seen that the moral axioms clearly deducible from the objective evidences disclose to man, as a moral agent, the presence and operation of a Divine law of right, of which God is the Author and Original; and that this law comes to him as the proper and legitimate law of his being, and presents itself to him under the form of moral obligation. It is to be observed that, in the discovery of this law, the ontological and moral nature of man is a main factor, and man is, himself, made or adapted to the evidence. Further, we trace in this adaptation the presence of a

universal law that governs all the cosmos. There, we everywhere see evidences of adaptation; of means suited to an end or purpose; and, in this fact we discover that man is, himself, within the unity of nature, and that all created things had one author. The same result that is reached by a direct appeal to man's ontological and moral qualities is reached by analogical inferences from physical laws. The efficacy of those laws and their universality, point to a moral lawgiver, and they demand from an intelligent moral agent his attentive obedience to the lessons they convey, as they are addressed to him.

These are the necessary and inherent evidences which are contained in and inseparable from creation itself. This evidence is present, necessarily, in every part of the habitable world, and in and with every individual therein, though in varying degrees of force as graduated to varying degrees of physical and mental advantage or disadvantage, arising from varying degrees of opportunity; yet, still leaving a necessary minimum of evidence and of moral responsibility.

These, I say, are the certain and fixed evidences contained in natural religion, objective and subjective, as a universal heritage, but, with this, as a starting point, and as a basis, we have, chronologically and historically, a developing evidence of an immediate and supra-natural character, fortifying and confirming the initial evidence; and, in the

Book of God, we trace (1) the assertion of the validity of the evidence in nature, and in the human conscience, (2) its illustration, and (3) its consolidation and unification.

The written record, in chronological and historic order, authenticates and unifies, with cumulative force, the evidence that is primary, fundamental and unwritten, and so, the Bible, from Genesis to Revelation, comes to us as the cumulation, and culmination of Theistic evidence, and is its complementum, as Theism finds its climax and complementum in Christianity. As I have stated, at the outset, our logical conclusion from the evidences in objective nature, as presented to man is, that God is knowable; the character of that knowledge and its conditions, I have stated more fully in the following notes.

It will be sufficient, here, simply to give a summary of the conclusions that follow and are to be deduced from this one central fact that God is knowable by man, and, of its consequent obligations. (1) A first condition of such knowledge is that man must obey the law of his being, and exercise all those powers with which God has endowed him. In other words, he must "diligently seek Him." (2) It is fundamentally necessary that he does so with a submissive will, or a readiness to obey the evidence. (3) It is, also, equally necessary that he does so with a sincere and wholehearted purpose. All our moral conceptions of

God, all the evidence that nature affords, and all the declarations in Holy Scripture go to assure us that, under such conditions God is not, and never has been, at any time, or in any place sought in vain. Finally, the fact is to be stated and to be emphasized, that under no other conditions, at any time, can man truly know, or come into fellowship with God.

CHAPTER III

THE BEING OF GOD, AS RELATED TO HIS MORAL GOVERNMENT

We have determined the fact and the character of the Divine Personality from His works in Creation, and from their subjective results, coupled with those moral intuitions which arise both from our ontological character and from the objective evidence.

The soul of man, as we have seen, is, in its distinctive nature, fitted to be governed by the evidence of God objectively presented to it. It is an obvious fact that both the Being of God, and the nature of the human soul, must be prime factors in determining the nature of His moral government; the one absolutely, the other derivatively.

We may say that (apart from the Bible) we have two sources from whence we derive a knowledge of the Being of God. The first and chief of these is His works, as Creator, conjoined with, what is a necessary sequence therefrom, that is, His Providence. The works of God direct us to His Personality; to a perfect intelligence, a perfect goodness, and a perfect power; and these, as representing unitedly an all-perfect Being.

The Bible, as an authoritative, divine and supernatural revelation, declares and amplifies this. But the objective evidence from nature is corroborated by the moral intuitions which are generic to man, ontologically considered.

Our conceptions of God which we may call inherent, as they flow from right reason and conscience, are that the First Cause of all things must necessarily be the perfection of all we know of wisdom, goodness and all moral excellence. These intuitions are given by Him as the result of objective evidence, and, as the result of His creative power upon us, and they call for the perfection, in Him, of all that we can know, and must recognize as good and excellent. The very term, virtue, represented to the heathen nations of Greece and Rome, what moral goodness, right, or holiness does to us. All these qualities, severally and distributively, represent a part, or aspect, of a combination which we can describe by no other term than a Personality; an All-Perfect Being. Thus, what we call the attributes of God, are only parts, or aspects, of His perfections, and are derived from, or as revealed qualities, adapted to our finite knowledge and conceptions; as we reason from the less to the greater. First, however, let us notice that these several qualities of perfection, or good that we ascribe to God, are, each of them, perfect, as they exist in Him.

One aspect of the Divine Being, as manifested to

us, is His constancy, or immutability,—as contrasted with the mutability of things around us, and with the instability and faithlessness of man. It is a prime ground of confidence and of comfort to creatures and to sinners.

It is brought out for our instruction and comfort by God Himself, in Holy Writ. It is applied, also to the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ, as being the same "yesterday, to-day and forever." It is next to be noticed that this quality and attribute, and all other perfections, as they are combined and unified in God's Personality, so, in such unification and combination the acme of perfection is reached.

For this reason, God, as the constant, and unchangeable Good, in His manifestation as such to us, is so manifested because of the fact of His self-existence. He is, Himself, the uncaused. He is the Everlasting "I am"; otherwise, He were not God. So, both His beneficence and immutability are aspects of His self-existence, and self-existence comprehends and contains complete, entire and eternal good.

In this connection I would recall consideration of the fact that the Personality of God is represented by Eternal Right, as the law of His own Being. God is the Right, as distinguished from the Wrong, as He is the Good, as distinguished from the Evil. By this we are assured that God will never contravene either equity, or goodness, in His requirements of duty from man; what we

ought to do, as contrasted with what we ought not to do; because that in Him they each exist in perfect ratio and proportion.

Thus, in requiring from a moral agent a moral and spiritual obedience, it is a moral, as distinguished from a simply intellectual obedience, and the moral requirement of obedience so characterized is, as to degree, regulated by the degree of knowledge and opportunity given to them individually, or collectively, "at sundry times and in divers manners." Such variety of degrees are, and have been, parts of the Divine economy. There has been, from the beginning, a progressive unfolding of the Divine plan and purpose; but, at the same time, a necessary minimum has been maintained, which has, always, left the free agent responsible. The moral sense of Right and Wrong has never wanted such a degree of light as, in perfect consonance with the character of God, left man, as a responsible being, and the subject of moral trial, amenable to the judgment of Him who, as a condition of His Being and character, will, eventually, reward the good man and punish the evil-doer. Also, it is to be noted that while there has been a progressive development of God's plan of moral government of the world, which has culminated in the Gospel of Jesus Christ, as Saviour of men, there has been no change in the prime factors of such government; and the inscrutability of God, as self-existent and eternal, has been maintained intact as an element of His Being, and, it may

be added, as an element also of His government. "Canst thou, by searching, find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? It is higher than Heaven, what canst thou do? It is deeper than Hell, what canst thou know?" (Job 11: 7, 8, 9). "His ways are past finding out" (Rom. 11: 33).

Also, as a prime factor in the case, it is always to be remembered that the sinfulness of sin remains, not only in the abstract character of moral evil; but as it is engrafted by the Fall of Adam on all his posterity. This factor in the case, modern criticism would disown and deny, but, as it is a foundation truth of the Bible, and as it is ratified as such by our Lord Jesus Christ and by the inspired writer of the New Testament as to its historical source and origin and as a dogmatic truth delivered to us; so it is asserted by the Ninth Article of our church, as a foundation truth of our Holy religion, and as an article of our Confession and belief.

We recognize that sin is essentially what it always was, since Adam's fall; that it is the "fault and corruption of the nature of every man that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam"; and that, as an "infection of nature, it remains even in them that are regenerate."

These are, severally the premises in the argument, as in the moral government of God.

"The Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the World" (1 John 4: 14). "The Son of Man

is come to seek and to save that which was lost" (Luke 19: 10).

The major premise is, that God is the Infinite Good; the minor premise is that man, as a sinner, is, by the Fall, alieniated from Him. To relieve such need, the Divine arm, itself, as the alone sufficient source of help, is stretched out. The moral government of God is required to be such as shall, at once, glorify Him, as God, in the processes of that government, while making redemption available to man.

These premises are fundamental to Theism, as it applies to our world, and this consideration, at the outset of the argument, is of great importance, as introductory to that which is to follow. In remarking upon the primary truth of the Being of God, I have referred to Him as the perfect Good; I did so, however, in reference to His natural attribute of self-existence, as the law natural, and distinctive of His being, as He is uncaused. I would further remark that the natural attributes of God's necessary immutability, and, also of His inscrutability, as they are truths fundamental to Theism, have a most important bearing upon the Theistic argument, as such argument is in contrast with the Theodicy of "Lux Mundi." In the previous chapter I have stated the foundation of the evidence, objective and subjective, for the Being and Personality of God, and have referred to the fact that the Bible, as an inspired and supernatural revelation from God, does but amplify

and consolidate the evidence, as it gathers up all Theistic evidences in an accumulated whole. I have, also, hereinbefore summarized the Theistic position, as to the Being of God, and His moral government, as related to such evidence. It is necessary, now, over against the Orthodox, Biblical and Theistic position, to place the Theodicy of "Lux Mundi," as stated by its authors. I shall, in so doing, quote chiefly from the essay on "The Christian Idea of God," as such essay stands related to their theodicy and, also, to the principles of Biblical Theism; and afterwards make such deductions as seem to me necessary and just in the premises.

The essayist has some very broad and bold statements to make at the outset, as to the effects of the new and Rationalistic Criticism, and he makes the statement that as faith is challenged by it, so the traditional or Biblical idea of God, is feeling the effects of it. I will, however, proceed to make verbatim quotations from the essay, premising only the fact that, upon page two, and at the beginning of his arguments, he states a principle that underlies it, as a whole, and also the whole of the volume of which it is a part. He claims that scientific truth, or that which is hypothetically claimed to be such, is homogeneous with supernatural or inspired truth, as given to us by God, in Holy Scripture. He then proceeds to establish a radical opposition between religion and philosophy; and as in the term "religion" he includes with all other systems, that of

Theism, or belief in the God of the Bible, and also the Bible itself, and especially the Old Testament; so, by a process of "evolution by antagonism," as he terms it, to purify what he considers to be, and what he designates as "immoral conceptions of God." Having so disposed of the distinctive character and authority of Holy Scripture, he proceeds to apply the principle of evolution by antagonism to its teaching concerning the character and personality of God. He states that "in religions, there is a survival of the fittest," and "this is reached in that religion which assimilates philosophy by fusion with it, so as to promote moral and intellectual truth"! Passing over some statements as to Reformation theology, Calvinistic doctrine, and the immorality of Roman Catholic theology; (and he classes them all in about one category, pp. 58–66) he says, (p. 67) that "it is the function of morality to purify the religious idea of God." Upon page sixty-eight he says, "The religious idea of God must justify itself to the highest known morality, and no amount of authority, ecclesiastical or civil, will make men worship an immoral God." "And, already that truth has thrown back its light upon questions of the Old Testament morality. We no longer say, "It is in the Bible approved, or allowed of God, and therefore it must be right."

I notice, here, the false statement of the orthodox and theistic position. False and unjust inferences are, in some cases, drawn as to the judicial acts of

the Most High; while in other cases it is falsely inferred that what the Bible delivers to us, as a faithful record of facts of history, are, because of that record, also facts allowed, or approved of God. The essayist adds also (p. 68), "But it (*i. e.*, the religious idea of God) is challenged not alone by conscience, but by the speculative reason." And upon page sixty-nine he says, "If then, the idea of God is to appeal to both the religious consciousness and speculative reason, it must be by claiming philosophy for religion, not by claiming religion for philosophy." That is to say, that religion must accept philosophy as homogeneous, by fusing itself with it, and it can only do so by eliminating from itself, or rejecting the supernatural and peculiar element; or, in other words, its distinctive and Divine element, or its peculiar and special inspiration by the Holy Ghost.

I speak here of course of that which is properly called religion, as in conformity to, and governed by the teaching of Holy Scripture.

It is to be noticed that the homogeneity here, by the essayist, declared, does, actually, make philosophy to be necessary, and to be paramount to Holy Scripture. Upon page seventy he says, "There was no fusion, as yet, of Jewish and Greek thought; only each was learning to understand the other, and unconsciously preparing the way for the higher synthesis of Christianity." That is to say, that evolution was to produce it. Upon page

seventy-eight he says, "This doctrine of the Omnipresence of God, as conceived by religion, had yet to be fused with the philosophic doctrine of immanence." This is made to square with mental evolution as opposed to supernatural revelation in Holy Scripture. Upon page eighty-two he says, "The immanence of God in nature, the higher Pantheism, is a truth essential to true religion, as it is to true philosophy." "The mission of modern science was designed of God, (!) to bring home to our unmetaphysical ways of thinking the great truth of the Divine immanence in creation, which is not less essential to the Christian idea of God, than to a philosophical view of Nature." So, also, "Our modes of thoughts are becoming increasingly Greek; and the flood which is, in our day, surging up against the traditional idea of God, is prevailingly Pantheistic in tone."

Upon page eighty, he makes the bold statement that "Even amongst those who believe that Christian morality is true, there are those to be found who have convinced themselves that they have intellectually outgrown the Christian faith." This, be it understood, is the logical result of their premises, in every case, where they are held. Upon page eighty-three, he says, "It seemed as if traditional Christianity was bound up with the view that God is wholly separate from the world, and not immanent in it."

"It remains then for Christianity to proclaim the

new truth (*i. e.*, evolution) and meet the new demands by a fearless reassertion of its doctrine of God." Again, "He (God) is the good to which all creation moves; the object alike of religion and philosophy, the eternal energy of the natural world, and the immanent Reason of the universe." So, page eighty-five, "the doctrine of the Trinity was unfolded (*i. e.*, evolved), in order to satisfy, alike, the demands of religion and of reason." "The gradual revelation of God, answering to the growing needs and capacities of man." "Reason interprets religion to itself; and, by interpreting, verifies and confirms it." "Religion therefore claims as its own, the new light which metaphysics and science are, in our day, throwing upon the truth of the immanence of God." "It dares to maintain that the fountain of wisdom and religion, alike, is God; and if these two streams shall turn aside from Him, both must assuredly run dry; for human nature craves to be both religious and rational, and the life that is not both is neither."

It must be understood that the term "religion," or "religious," does not, as used by "Lux Mundi" mean Theism, or Christianity distinctively and solely, but it includes all systems of religion, alike, which they consider homogeneous in character, also their subjective results. Also in the Theodicy of "Lux Mundi," while this particular essay deals negatively with the subject of the "idea of God,"

and attacks the Scripture doctrine of His Personality, in the assertion of "the higher Pantheism," it also directly attacks the acts of God's Supreme Personality as Moral Governor, and the doctrines that are peculiar to, and distinctive of Theism. Two of these doctrines are scornfully reprobated as immoral, by the author of this essay,—*i. e.*, the doctrine of God's Sovereignty in Election to Salvation; and the doctrine of the atonement, and the substitutionary and vicarious sufferings and death of Christ. This last is made the subject of special attack in a separate essay, in which the substitutionary death of Christ is distinctly repudiated, and His office as Saviour of men nullified.

Such is the attitude of the Evolutionary Theory of the Being and Moral Government of God. Our first reflection upon it is that the author of the particular essay considered here (as indeed of all the essayists) aims at certitude; nominally, by means of a fusion of philosophy with religion, but, really, this result is aimed at by philosophy, alone. It remains, however, true that our knowledge of God, and of Divine Truth, even by Christ, is relative, and not absolute; also, that this knowledge is not and cannot be attained by philosophy (the world by wisdom knew not God) in part, or in whole. It rests upon no human foundation. Also, God remains, after revelation of Himself in Jesus Christ, and after the completion of the New Testament Canon of Holy Scripture; He remains, as He

always was,—the same, Wonderful, and Incomprehensible Jehovah!

A further consideration of the trend and requirements of the philosophical criticism is, that it asserts for itself a Theodicy that is not only unbiblical, and also antitheistic, in relation to the first principles of Theism, but also illogical. That is to say, illogical from its theological premises and standpoint as claiming to represent the articles of the Christian faith. The hypothesis to which the authors of "Lux Mundi" stand committed, and, in conformity with which, as the premises in their scheme of a Theodicy,—such scheme as framed is, logically, consistent only, with Pantheism, as a thinly veiled substitute for atheism. Its necessary premise may be found in its conclusion. It is necessary to their premise to attack the first element of Theism, contained in the first article of our church. "There is one living and true God, everlasting, without body, parts, or passions, the Maker and Preserver of all things, visible and invisible."

This cardinal element of Theism includes not only the character of God, but His Personality; and this is attacked by them in more than one of His attributes, essential to His Being, and so explicitly declared both in nature and in Holy Scripture. They, themselves, describe their doctrine of God's immanence in creation, as "the higher Pantheism," and declare, also, that "the flood, which

in our day is rising up against the traditional (or Biblical) idea of God, is increasingly Pantheistic in tone."

They cannot get over philosophic difficulties in the way of their hypothesis, by which certitude as to God and to Divine things (I mean philosophic demonstration, and not the certitude of a reasonable faith, resting on sufficient evidence) is denied to man, without asserting an actual superiority for, and necessity of philosophy (false or true); so that inspired, or supernatural Truth, representing, be it remembered, the Authority and Personality of God, must be made out to be homogeneous with it, and, even subservient to it; but, also, the necessary conceptions of the human mind as to what is essential to the fact of a Self-Existent Being, viz., that of a Perfect, as well as a Supreme Personality;—what we are taught concerning Him, from His works in creation, and most explicitly by the historic and dogmatic teachings of His inspired Word, as ratified by the authority and personal teaching of His Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, must, all, give way to the governing principle which they have laid down, in evolution as an absolute, and universal law in the order and government of the world, physically and morally; and the very character of and the conditions under which a Deity will be allowed, or acknowledged to rule the universe, is required to be regulated by it.

Is it not logically demonstrated that such a sys-

tem can be described by no other term than anti-theistic and anti-christian?

Herbert Spencer is a true witness when he says that, pressed to a logical issue, evolution cannot be made to consist with the acknowledgment of a Personal First Cause.

The consideration of the attitude of "Lux Mundi" to other elements of Theism will come up in their order, in the course of our positive argument.

I cannot leave this particular subject without giving emphatic denial of my assent to a cardinal principle in the Theodicy of "Lux Mundi," *i. e.*, that philosophic truth, as proceeding from the human mind, is homogeneous in character with the Bible as the Book of God; as a supernatural, Divine and authoritative communication from God, and revelation of His character and will. As a Biblical Theist, I take my stand in absolute and unqualified acceptance of, and in reliance upon God's Holy Word, as the alone and final criterion of Divine Truth, and I cite the teaching of St. Paul, under Divine inspiration, when in the first Epistle to the Corinthians, he puts such philosophical wisdom in contrast with God's wisdom; and where he says, "Where is the wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the disputer of this world? Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world? For, after that in the wisdom of God, the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe" (1 Cor.

19: 20, 21). Moreover, in the nineteenth verse of that chapter God has declared His purpose to "destroy the wisdom of the wise, and to bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent." The authors of "Lux Mundi" will reply to this (and consistently too, with their hypothesis of evolution), "The world has grown wiser"; "We are living in the nineteenth century!" In effect, the Bible is antiquated and out of date! In the language of the essayist on "the Christian idea of God," "There are those to be found, even amongst those who believe that Christian morality is true, who have convinced themselves that they have outgrown the Christian faith." Can anything be plainer?

CHAPTER IV

THE PROVIDENCE OF GOD, AS RELATED TO HIS MORAL GOVERNMENT AND TO THE PANTHEISTIC DOCTRINE OF IMMANENCE IN CREATION

THE Providence of God, logically considered, is a necessary sequence from His being and personality.

The evidence present, both in the works of nature, and in man's moral consciousness, is fortified by the judicial and mandatory action of the faculty of God—consciousness; and such combined evidences are a sufficient appeal to his intellectual and critical faculty, as a moral agent; yet, as these evidences, powerful and sufficient though they be, do not assume such authority as to infringe upon the necessary character of free-agency; but leave room for, as they appeal to the faith of a voluntary and intelligent being; so is it to be said of the fact and of the doctrine of Divine Providence. Such doctrine, as it rests upon fact, rests upon evidence, and upon trustworthy evidence; yet, the evidence, in this case, as in the former, requires, but justly requires faith. So must all moral truth, as it proceeds from God. Without such a faith all the facts of Divine superintendence, as of the Divine existence,

will have no real substance. Although, in ignoring the presence and actings, mediate or immediate, of the Divine supernatural, reason and truth may be violated; whether the resistance to truth be overt and palpable, or whether it be of a more modified or disguised character, yet, if the "eye" of the soul be not "single"; if the Ego of the man be arrayed against the evidence, his whole ontological and moral faculties, as a responsible being, will be "full of darkness." I would, then, merely say, in the first place that, on the same premises as we rest the fact that "there is one living and true God, everlasting," we rest the no less certain fact of His personal, immediate and perfect superintendence and disposal of all the works of His hands. The being and personality of God, and the Providence of God, as a fact, are in the closest possible connections. As the nature of that Being and the fact of that Divine Personality is of primary consequence; as we have arrived at the fact of the existence of so great and glorious a Personality and First Cause of all things; as such Personality is above, beyond and prior to; as He is absolutely distinct from everything we see or know of; as He is the absolute Cause of all; so, upon this basis, and from this fact, we now proceed to state that such Providence as we recognize and declare, does manifest and exhibit His transcendent perfections; and, while such supervision and disposal is exercised over all His creation, it is exercised in a most marked and pe-

culiar manner over man, as he is made (ontologically) in the image of God.

While it is true that any real and just conception of a Supreme First Cause must, in the abstract, include and require a conception of His necessary transcendence, as of His Personality, it is to be remarked that, in very many places in Holy Writ, God states this transcendence in the strongest possible manner. He states it as an abstract, inherent and primary fact,—apart from its actings and operation; but, He also enforces and applies it, as so operative. "I, even I, am Jehovah, and beside Me there is no Saviour. I have declared and have saved, and I have shewed when there was no strange God among you; therefore, ye are My witnesses, saith Jehovah, that I am God. Yea, before the day was I am He, and there is none that can deliver out of My hand; I will work and who shall let it" (Is. 43 : 11, 12, 13; also 45 : 5, 6, 7).

While "miracles and wonders and signs" were, no doubt, designed of God to emphasize His Personality and oversight, they were but the extraordinary manifestations of an actual, regular and constant, but not the less personal and transcendent superintendence, and disposal of all His creation; although such manifestations are, as well as His regular and constant care is, specially directed unto Man.

The way in which His providence and care is referred to in Holy Scripture, at large, is concurrent

testimony to establish the same truth, as to the character of such supervision.

It is manifest, from such references and descriptions, as they pervade sacred history, that such Providence, although a fixed and primary truth of Natural Religion, yet, as it manifests and declares all the Divine perfections, is nevertheless occupied as certainly, as pervasively and as perfectly with the one individual, as if he, or she, only, were the subject of such care, instead of but one of a multitude that cannot be numbered; yet, equally and perfectly known of and cared for by Almighty God. This is stated in general terms in Holy Scripture. "The eyes of the Lord are in every place beholding the evil and the good" (Prov. 15: 3). "The eyes of the Lord run to and fro throughout the whole earth to shew Himself strong on behalf of them whose hearts are perfect towards Him" (1 Chron. 15: 9). "I, the Lord, search the heart, I try the reins, even to give every man according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings" (Jer. 17: 10). "From Heaven did the Lord behold the earth, to hear the groaning of the prisoner, to loose them that are appointed to death" (Ps. 102: 20, 21). So in Ps. 107, the Psalmist discourses of God's varied providences over all estates and conditions of men.[1] To proceed to particular instances. Let

[1] Good George Herbert, in his Priest to the Temple, has wisely discoursed on the "Parson's consideration of Providence."

He gives what we may designate as a full description of its

us first notice the case of Enoch. He "walked with God, and was not, for God took him" (Gen. 5 : 24). So God said of Noah, "Noah found grace in the eyes of the Lord. Noah was a just man, and perfect in his generations; and Noah walked with God" (Gen. 6 : 8, 9).

Of him it is further said that God expressed His cognizance and approval when He told him to enter into the ark; "For thee have I seen righteous before Me in this generation" (Gen. 7 : 1). On the other hand, we are told that "God looked on the earth

varied aspects. He says that "God hath and exerciseth a threefold power in everything that concerns man. The first is a sustaining power; the second is a governing power; the third, a spiritual power. To the first, he refers the ordinary and settled laws of creation, providing for man's sustenance. To the second he refers those personal intercourses by which, in His sovereignty, He can give or withhold as He sees fit." As illustrating the third aspect of God's providence, referred to by Herbert,—viz., His overruling providence, some instances of those which pervade Holy Scripture, may be now given. In the 107th Psalm, David says, "He turneth a fruitful land into barrenness for the wickedness of them that dwell therein. Again, He turneth the wilderness into a fruitful land, and maketh water springs of a dry ground" (vs. 34, 35).

To the third, or spiritual power of God's providence, Herbert refers the fact that He makes "all things to work together for good, to them that love God," while, to the wicked, "He curses their blessings," and makes them, "in the fulness of their sufficiency to be in straits."

And it is to be remarked that in the exercise of His governing power, either to the righteous, or to the wicked, in giving, or in withholding, His Sovereign will, in the transcendent, and often inscrutable exercise of His supreme perfections, and prerogative, is immediately and directly declared.

and behold it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth" (Gen. 6: 12). Of Abraham God said, "I know Abraham that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord to do justice and judgment, that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which He hath spoken of him" (Gen. 18: 19). The promises made to Abraham were confirmed to Isaac and Jacob.

To Jacob God said, when he appeared to him at Bethel, "I am with thee, and will keep thee in all places whither thou goest, and will bring thee again unto this land; for I will not leave thee until I have done that which I have spoken to thee of" (Gen. 28: 15). The story of Joseph, and of God's singular providence over him, as it is intensely pathetic, it is a striking illustration of the particular and pervasive providence of God.

It is iterated and reiterated, "The Lord was with Joseph." In like manner the subsequent history of the patriarch, as it declares the fulfilment of God's promises, is also marvelously illustrative of His providence and paternal care. Moreover, it is true, also, that the history of individual men without the pages of inspiration, and also facts within our own personal knowledge and experience, go to further illustrate and declare the wondrous, transcendent and supernatural agency of Him "In whom we live and have our being." God confided to Abraham His own purposes and disposal in relation to his

posterity, in the future,—the privations they should undergo, and their subsequent entrance into the promised land. All this expresses and declares the extraneous and transcendent operations of All-Perfect Being. I will give but one or two illustrations and instances. The overthrow of Ahithophel's counsel, although brought about by Hushai's instrumentality, and at David's suggestion to Hushai, is declared to have been "of the Lord," who had "appointed (thus) to defeat the good counsel of Ahithophel, to the intent that He might bring evil upon Absalom" (2 Sam. 17 : 14). Also, thus, be it noted God answered the prayer of David "O Lord, I pray Thee, turn the counsel of Ahithophel into foolishness!" (2 Sam. 15 : 31). So, we are told of the division of the kingdom, after Solomon's death.

It was in pursuance of an expressed purpose of God; and when the king Rehoboam assembled an army to reduce the ten tribes to subjection, Shemaiah was instructed of God to say to him and to the house of Judah, "Ye shall not do this; return every man to his house, for this thing is of me" (1 Kings 13 : 24).

To Cyrus, God said, "I have surnamed thee, though thou hast not known Me" (Is. 45 : 4).

In short, while the Shekinah, which led the Israelites in their journeys was a standing expression of God's presence with them, and of His Providence over them; and His guidance, in particular cases,

was to be sought and enquired for, by Urim and Thummim; to fail to make this latter enquiry, as occasion arose, was a sin against Jehovah; as when the Israelites made peace with the Gibeonites; "And the men took of their victuals and asked not counsel at the mouth of the Lord" (Joshua 9 : 14). To attempt to exhaust the evidence would be to transcribe a large portion of the Holy Scriptures. I shall therefore proceed, from this notice of the transcendency of God's Providence, to a similar notice that such transcendence is characterized by all the elements of the Divine Personality, as Supernatural. I will but summarize this, as follows: We see, in the general actings of God's Providence as historically set forth in the Bible, and it may be added, as ratified by Christian experience, (*a*) wisdom, (*b*) power, (*c*) omnipresence, (*d*) justice, (*e*) love, (*f*) inscrutability, and, lastly, spirituality and pervasiveness. I do not intend to comment upon these several elements or aspects of Divine Providence; sufficient to say that, as they are aspects of His Divine Personality, they are inseparable from each other, as the colors of the rainbow are from a beam of light; they are elements of God's Being, and, so, of His acts and operations, and especially as directed to responsible man. I desire to direct special attention to two features of God's Providence, and, first, to speak of its spirituality, and pervasiveness. Viewed from the standpoint of the Bible, as an authentic record of

facts, whether those facts are specially declarative of one aspect, or of another aspect of the Divine character, they manifest a spirituality and a pervasiveness that is distinctive and Divine; whether it applies to power, to love, to knowledge, to wisdom, to truth, or to equity; each and all, spiritual, perfect and pervasive.

This, be it remembered, is Divine character, in its operations. Nothing is mechanical or stereotyped; it is the plastic, sensitive, and diffusive action and pulsation of forceful and perfect life.

So, too, of the other feature which is specially to be considered. It is peculiarly characteristic of Deity, and is an essential element, identified with the Self-Existent, and Eternal One, and synonymous of God as the All-Perfect; viz., His inscrutability.

Let us remember that we have to do with the Infinite mind, and it is with Him, infinity in everything. "Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty to perfection? It is higher than Heaven. What canst thou do? Deeper than Hell, what canst thou know?" (Job 11: 7, 8).

It is with this thought of limitlessness and infinity, and so, of inscrutability, that Job was humbled and silenced; and he bowed down before the exhibition and memorial of the Divine perfections. We have been regarding the Providence of God from the historic standpoint; we will now re-

gard it from the standpoint of experience. This perfect and Divine Providence is an actuality, and a blessed actuality to the believer; to the spiritual Christian.

It is to be noticed that while the fact of God's Providence and care, as exercised towards those who put their trust in Him, is an elementary and fixed truth of Natural Religion, and, so, universal in its operation, it is also one of the most cherished and comfortable facts of the Christian life.

The presence of God with the soul is connected with the presence of His Spirit within the soul. The result is a "fellowship" with Him, a walking with God, but it is seen, felt and realized only by the believer; but as so felt, realized and enjoyed, it leads on to greater trust, by the power of moral evidences and under moral law. It includes a relative intellectual perception of truth relating to God; but it is distinctively an enjoyment which comes from faith and obedience to God; and experience of God, so derived, leads us to absolute trust in Him. Trust in His Personality; trust in His character. "They that know Thy name will put their trust in Thee; for Thou Lord hast not failed them that seek Thee." Faith of this character led to the distinction awarded of God to Abraham, as the father of the faithful. "Now I know thou fearest God seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thy only son from Me" (Gen. 22: 12).

In regard to His inscrutability in Providence,

there is frequent reference to this in Holy Writ. "Thou shalt praise the name of the Lord thy God, who hath dealt wondrously with you, and my people shall never be ashamed" (Joel 2 : 26, 27). So, too, be it remarked, faith takes hold of God's inherent and distinctive nature and personality. "Though He slay me (says Job) yet will I put my trust in Him" (Job 13 : 15). It is said of Abraham that against hope he believed in hope, "according to that which was spoken so shall thy seed be" (Rom. 4 : 18). Such quotations might be multiplied. In view of the actings of faith in His people, God says, "Because he hath put his trust in Me, therefore will I deliver him; I will set him up, because he hath known My name" (Ps. 91 : 14). Their faith and holy character is able to trust Him, where they are, in their own histories, wholly unable to trace Him, and they know Him, not by metaphysical or philosophical subtleties, but by faith and holy obedience. Inscrutability is inscribed upon the ways of God, historically and experimentally considered, and such ways are but relatively known even by His people who trust in Him; their faith does but touch the margin, as it were, of that boundless ocean of Divine wisdom and goodness, and they admiringly say, as they bow before the grandeur of His limitless and unmeasured perfections, "Thy way is in the sea and Thy path is in the great waters, and Thy footsteps are not known" (Ps. 77 : 19).

God's inscrutability, to the trustful and confiding child of God, is no bar to his comfort, but rather a source of joyful reflection, as he realizes that this Infinite One, inscrutable in many ways, even in His love, is his God, forever and ever, his portion and inheritance in time and in eternity.

The words of the apostle Paul, by the Holy Ghost, voices the heart's utterance of all believers; "O the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God, now unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been His counselor? or who hath first given to Him, and it shall be recompensed unto Him again; for of Him and through Him, and to Him are all things, to whom be glory forever, Amen" (Rom. 11: 33 ad finem).

We now turn to contrast this exhibition of the Divine character, as seen in the actings of His Providence, with the elaborate and metaphysical theory of the "Higher Pantheism," or the doctrine of God's immanence in Creation. It is a necessary part of that mechanical theory of absolute development, as an universal law, both in matter and mind, pervading all departments of life, civil and ecclesiastical, and religious; and so, governing all history. As it pervades thought, so, in the course of such development, it unifies it; and not only does it unify thought (according to the Theodicy of "Lux Mundi"), but also, by implication, it unifies charac-

ter. It is part of the theory, in its objective aspect, that there is actual unity in all religions.

The Jewish and Gentile cosmogonies had much in common. It is at least a question whether Theism was not "evolved" from polytheism. It is required, in order to give logical consistency to their theory. They prefer to state it by inference and implication, as an unsettled question. Evidently, they favor it. As all religions are, according to "Lux Mundi," more or less immoral; in the course of the unification, or fusing of Jewish and Greek thought, philosophical morality is invested with the office of purifying not only religion, generally, including that of the Old Testament, but also its teaching, and our ideas of God. This principle is applied to the Old Testament history and teaching, as well as to the religions of the heathen world. We are told in this connection that "The history of pre-christian religions, and pre-christian philosophy was a long preparation for the Gospel." I will not pursue their statements in detail, but merely give some instances. (P. 67), "The function of morality is to purify the religious idea of God." (P. 56), "For, in religions, too, there is a struggle for existence, in which the fittest survive; and the test of fitness is the power to assimilate and promote moral and intellectual truth, and so to satisfy the whole man." (P. 84), "It remains, then, for Christianity to claim the new truth, and meet the new demands by a fearless reassertion of its doctrine of God. It has to bring forth

out of its treasure things new and old,—the old, almost forgotten truth of the immanence of the Word; the belief in God as Creation's secret force, illuminated and confirmed as that is by the advance of science, and as it comes to us with all the force of a new discovery. Slowly and under the shock of controversy, Christianity is recovering its buried truth, and realizing the greatness of its heritage. It teaches still that God is the Eternal existent One, the Being on whom we depend, and in whom we live; the source of all reality, the good to which all creation moves, the object, alike, of religion and philosophy, the eternal energy of the natural world, and the immanent Reason of the Universe."

And so, with regard to all truth, whether it comes from the side of science, or of history, or of criticism, he adopts neither the method of surrender nor protest, but the method of assimilation (p. 48).

This may suffice. Chapters 1 and 2 are replete with such statements. So, of the chapter on the "Preparation in history for Christ." The idea of assimilation is applied to objective teaching and to subjective character. Both are to be unified, or "fused." Christianity is to "assimilate" everything; draw no distinction between natural or supernatural; or, rather, make the supernatural to give place to the philosophic, scientific and critical, or properly speaking, human element. For the governing idea is that of immanence; not Divine Personality and transcendence; the Divine supernatural.

All truth is one, and, if religion is to be recognized at all, it must consent that Reason, or Metaphysics, shall be dominant by "assimilation" (rather let us say by absorption or neutralization). Although, in theoretically accepting the Incarnation, as ultimate Truth, it nominally gives Christianity the palm; it is with this proviso, viz., that it will consent to the "fusion," or assimilation aforesaid. For "God is the immanent Reason of the Universe," or (transposed) "The immanent Reason of the Universe is God." This is, of course, equivalent to the statement that their doctrine is pantheistic, and so it is. I shall now summarize this comparative survey, by pointing out the fact that such a metaphysical and rationalistic hypothesis is essentially mechanical in its nature. (*a*) It, actually, excludes the personality of God, because it nullifies, if it does not formally and explicitly deny His transcendent operations in the universe; both in the governance of mind and of matter. (*b*) As this system, or theodicy, based on cosmical evolution, as a hypothesis, may properly be termed a mechanical system, so, by consequence, the general trend of the theory may be said to conflict with man's free-agency, as a responsible being. It may also be remarked that this philosophical theory, from its intrinsic character, and as a system, necessarily ignores the primary or fundamental truth on which all God's revelation to man is based, viz., the historic fact of the Fall of Man from God, and of the fact and doctrine of Original Sin, as its

consequence, and as set forth to us, authoritatively in Holy Scripture.

(*c*) From the comparison herein made of this system, and its doctrine of "immanence" with the teaching of Holy Scripture as to God's personal providence in creation, and specially over man, it is sufficiently evidenced, as a fact, that it conflicts with, or rather is in contrast with the facts and teaching of Biblical Theism in this particular.

(*d*) Furthermore, it is to be said that the logical and moral result of this theodicy is the principle of universal salvation, and, also, of the doctrine of sinless perfection, because, as by fusion, it seeks to unify all objective truth, whether scientific, critical, philosophical, historical or supernatural, *i. e.*, Divine Truth, so, also, with reference to subjective character, and the doctrine of "perfection." As a theodicy this system is based upon the incarnation; and, by its doctrine of sacramental grace, which it sets forth in absolute terms, it teaches "a receptivity, through conscious recognition, of which it is impossible to fix a limit!" From the general tenor of its teaching, in this connection, we are justified in inferring that this receptivity comes through the avenues both of metaphysical philosophy and of sacramental grace.

(*e*) And, finally, they consider it in the true line of advance, consistent alike with the principles of evolution, and of truth that "Our modes of thought are increasedly Greek"; and they deprecate what

they call "our too unmetaphysical way of thinking." We certainly do them no injustice in saying that, as compared with the Bible, philosophy, metaphysics and modern science, as developed by evolution, are truth of the highest order. Their theory is, that all truth is homogeneous in character, yet, actually and practically, Biblical truth is subordinate in character to philosophy, in their system, (1) because they assert that it is the province of morality to purify all religion, and (2) because that the objective faith which it is the office of the Church to assert, with all authority, is to be regulated and varied under the law of evolutionary progress in scientific discoveries; which discoveries have all the force of inspiration.

To say that this theodicy, put forth by a body of men who are occupants of the sacred office of teachers in the church of God, is flatly contrary to the teaching of God's Holy Word, albeit that they have solemnly accepted that Word as the rule of their ministry, and promised to make it their business to "drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine" contrary thereto, is to say that which needs no proof nor argument; herein it is but the recital of their own creed, which they themselves have formulated, however incompatible it may be and is with their ordination vows, as ministers of the Church of England.

They bow to the authority of science, metaphysics and philosophy, as the *ne plus ultra* of Truth. I

presume that they will acknowledge the force and authority of logic, as it represents sound reason, and allow that it is homogeneous, though it is, certainly, not identical with those elements which they so specially exalt and magnify; and I will make bold to say that the elaborate production that is the result of their premises will no more abide investigation in the court of logic than it will in the Supreme Court of Holy Scripture.

Tried by that just and inexorable law of sound reason, which after all is God's gift and God's law, there will be found to be no cohesion nor solid foundation for the house they have built, or the materials of which it is composed. I speak of it as a theodicy, supposed to be consistent with, and authorized by the Christian system of doctrinal religion; actually, its basis is philosophy as represented by evolution. Such philosophy is its prime factor and controlling power; it is its governing element; and, for the reason that, under the law of evolution, as supreme, there can be no stable objective faith; for this, and for other reasons, as a theodicy it is, logically, null and void.

The Personality and Providence of God as related to the teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ.

I may properly apply the argument I have used in a previous chapter in relation to the teaching of our Lord and Saviour, to the subject now before us.

It is specially pertinent, for the reason before given, *i. e.*, that "Lux Mundi" makes the Incarnation and the New Testament to be the basis of dogmatic Theism.

Throughout our Lord's teaching, while He asserts in no uncertain way His own personality as the Son of God, He at the same time asserts, if possible, with more insistence and constancy the personality and government of God the Father. If He asserts His own personality, it is, very generally, as that personality stands related to God the Father, as Creator and Moral Governor. He dwells upon the fact that the Father has "sanctified and sent Him into the world"; that He "did not come of Himself, but that He sent Him"; and, further, that His power and authority as Messiah and Saviour was a delegated power and authority. Similarly does He connect all the glories of human redemption with the primary, personal and essential glory of God, as Creator and Moral Governor.

It may, most certainly and emphatically, be said that all the glories of a revealed redemption and salvation through a mediator, originate from and are dependent upon the primary truth of God's personality and attributes, as the universal Father of His creatures. Hence, it is very evident and clear that upon the basis of the person and offices of our Lord Jesus Christ, the stability, necessity and primary value of natural evidences receive their highest and strongest ratification and support. Our

Lord's habitual language in reference to God is the declaration of His universal Fatherhood! Addressing Himself to His disciples, He frequently speaks of "your Father," in the same way that He connects the Fatherhood with His own personality as Son of Man; (My Father and your Father, My God and your God. John 20: 17) but, from that standpoint, it is because of a Fatherhood as realized and accepted (on their part) because believed on. The objective fact remains a fact, to all; a fact in evidence. "If we believe not, He abideth faithful; He cannot deny Himself" (2 Tim 2: 13). This primary, general and essential truth of God's personality and character is, as such, inseparable from both the fact and doctrine of creation as the work of God; and, also from the doctrine of His providential care.

He speaks of the certainty, and also of the universality, as He asserts the fact, and also asserts the connection in each case, and declares the marvelous character of His personality and also that of the Providence of God. He does so in the same way as He speaks of the power, wisdom and love of God, as Creator, in forming, fashioning and providing for all that He has made. His care and His providence are as much necessary and essential truths as are those of His personality as First Cause, and Creator of all things.

Hence, in order to fortify our confidence in God's personality, He tells us "Not a sparrow falleth to

the ground without your Father." "Even the very hairs of your head are all numbered." "Fear ye not, therefore; ye are of more value than many sparrows" (Matt. 10: 30, 31).

As a general truth, and as an element of Theism, it is to be said that, throughout Holy Scripture, the specific, elementary and necessary truth of a particular Providence, as the evidence and result of God's character, and being, is everywhere and always maintained and reiterated. This specific doctrine, like the personality of God, is incapable of evolution, development or change; it is necessary and eternal. The foregoing considerations are, I think, sufficient evidence to declare that, from no point of view does the hypothesis of evolution receive a more emphatic denial than from the recorded teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ, as the great Prophet of His Church, concerning the primary truth of God's universal Fatherhood, and from the character of His unfailing and universal providence and care over the works of His hands.

CHAPTER V

THE CHURCH OF GOD, AS AN ELEMENT OF THEISM

THE fact of the Divine existence and personality, in its necessary character and connections with His moral government, being established, the next subject in order of relation thereto, both logically and spiritually considered, is the Church of God.

First, I desire to notice the logical and necessary relation.

The existence, personality and character of God, and the objective evidence of that personality and character, as exhibited to moral agents so constituted as we are, makes a certain moral result, as a sequence, of that evidence, so exhibited, to be necessary and sure. By moral and spiritual law, so operative upon the moral nature of the individual subject; from the character of the evidence; from the presiding government and care of a personal First Cause upon the faculties of the individual soul, as by the determinative act of that soul; an elimination, a personal and moral elimination, by reason of individual acceptance and submission to, or rejection of, and disobedience to the God of Truth and Goodness, must necessarily follow. Faith or unbelief of the evidence is the moral test of char-

acter. That some would believe the evidence,—in itself considered,—is a necessary moral sequence, and, viewed in connection with experience and with Biblical facts and teaching, such result is beyond question. But—further—as the evidence is of Divine facts, so must be the faith related thereto. As the First Law Eternal and First-Cause is essentially supernatural, so of the law that He has ordained to bring man into moral and spiritual relations of union with Himself. Also, as the facts referred to require such a moral and spiritual result as a moral elimination to God, from sin and evil,—as a determinate act of the individual soul, so, the same law, so operative, describes an individual and personal elimination, as well as the presidency and supremacy of the Supreme Agent and First Cause.

To the individual the evidence is presented, the privilege and benefits are offered, and the responsibility belongs. Upon the basis, then, of facts and upon the grounds of reason, we arrive at a certain conclusion as to the existence of the Church of God as a Divine work; and, also, we have a definite and certain assurance of its being, in its origin, composed of individual believers, collectively constituting what is described as "a remnant," and "a little flock"; individually and severally, under moral law, the subjects of God's electing and saving grace. Their moral separation to God is primarily traceable to the Divine government and personality, as First Cause—and, mediately to their in-

dividual and personal action upon the evidence, under Divine grace and help.

It is important, here, to observe that in thus defining the being (ἀρχή) of the Church, as an element of Theism, and as a necessary sequence to the temptation and fall of man, as delivered to us in Holy Scripture; the subjective result of that trial which, as individuals, the human race must, under the moral government of God, undergo, does not, in itself involve any distinctive theological principle in regard to free-agency. We are free, in this respect, to draw our own inferences from the collective evidence afforded us in the Word of God.

According to the "proportion of faith," we may emphasize the undoubted truth of the sovereignty of God, and the excellency of supernatural grace; or, we may with equal propriety maintain the doctrine of human responsibility; in either case, these doctrines do not and cannot contravene a moral sequence, and a certain fact, from which, logically, upon Theistic and Biblical premises, there is no escape. The fact I refer to is a necessary separation, and dualism of character. This dualism of character dates from the time of Cain and Abel; the fact of association of the worshippers of God dates from the time of Shem. If the question be here raised, Was the Church founded at that time? the answer is determined by the view taken of what is necessary to such organization or constitution. I think it correct to say that the Church

then took form as a society, and also as a Divine society; yet, withal formed under the natural, or moral law of character. It is only necessary to remember that this was the formative era, and preparatory to that further development and manifestation which was to follow from and under a Positive law with expressed sanctions, delivered with Divine authority; and, at the same time, written under Divine and supernatural inspiration. Such a development of the Church was consonant with all that surrounded it; yet, although thus consolidated and manifested, the distinctive principle which constituted the being of the Church was expressed and contained, as a result of probation, and of the moral law of character. From the time of Shem, it was, as it is now a "congregation or gathering of faithful men," and, as such, "a communion of saints."

The law of sacrifice was declared as a fact; but it was not developed in the form of a Divine ritual, nor was it, as afterwards, committed exclusively to the ministration of a select order. It would appear that both the priestly and the prophetic offices were latent, and in embryo, in the believer. The generic title "man of God" expressed both. So Abraham was declared of God to be "a prophet," and we know that he, as well as Noah, offered sacrifices, in obedience, as we infer, to an unwritten law.

I now turn from the abstract and essential facts

of Theism and of moral law to the concrete and specific teaching of Holy Scripture.

The Church in its normal and proper acceptation is the congregation (ἐκκλησία), of the elect (ἐκλεκτοι); but the existence of the Church is a necessary moral sequence from the fall of man, as the primary fact in the history of our race. It appears to me to be not only pertinent, but necessary to establish this fact, as I think that we have established the fact of the Divine Personality as a cardinal issue with the advocates of the hypothesis of evolution. The Divine Personality and that hypothesis not only have no coherence between them, but they are, I conceive at antipodes to each other. By the same line of argument we may ask the advocates of atomic development, or those who restrict evolution, as a law operative, only, after creation, as a Divine work; the personality of God in the abstract, and creation as a fact, and in the abstract, being acknowledged, while the book of Genesis as a Divine history of creation is denied; what explanation is offered by "Lux Mundi" as to the cause and origin of moral depravity, seeing that the fall of man is declared to be a myth or legend? It is a very noticeable fact that every philosophic theory devised to elucidate, or to supersede Holy Scripture, or the problems therein contained, evinces a marked dislike to natural religion; and its advocates seek, in every possible way, to depreciate its force, as an evidence of Theism.

Whence, we may ask, has man derived those ineradicable ideas of right and wrong, of good and evil? Every attempt to deny their existence, character and origin is futile and vain.

Despite all the forces in opposition, the evidence, objective and subjective, for God, remains valid. Objective nature is a fact! The God of nature is a fact! A particular Providence is a fact! Conscience in man is a fact; and it is an inevitable sequence from the objective evidence, as from man's moral constitution; although Mr. Illingworth, in "Lux Mundi," does seek to mitigate the argument from conscience, as a force in natural religion, by asserting that "functions react on the faculties, even in our conscience and our reason too;" and he tells us, at the same time, that "In fact, the evolutionary origin of man is a far less serious question than the attack on final causes" ("Lux Mundi" pp. 161, 162). Notwithstanding all this special pleading against the evidence,—the fact of a personal Creator,—as objectively declared in His works without, and in our moral constitution within, are facts that are too much for the hypothesis of evolution.

So, too, are the facts "of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment," as subjects of the Holy Spirit's appeal to man's moral nature,—as facts of our consciousness, realities from which no individual can escape.

The appalling fact of the reign of sin in the world, and of the evils which the Bible declares to be the result of man's fall from God, and from Holiness is

a fact beyond dispute, or denial, and "Lux Mundi," accordingly, acknowledges the fact of sin and of suffering and evil as existent, while it denies the only possible solution, as given to us of God, in Holy Scripture, and denies it to be fact and history. They acknowledge the fact, I say, but they give no solution of it; although they reject the solution given in Holy Scripture, and that on which the whole of the Bible, both the Old and New Testament is based, and with which it is connected, historically, doctrinally and practically. I do but state the fact. I shall not, here, trace its consequences. We start from the established premise that "there is one living and true God, everlasting, without body, parts or passions, of infinite power, wisdom and goodness, the Maker and Preserver of all things, both visible and invisible, and in unity of this Godhead there are three persons, of one substance, power and eternity, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost" (Art. 1).

The Bible history of our race recognizes most clearly, as identified with God's character and man's trial in a state of provisional innocency, the existence and operation of an arch-spirit of evil. That man was created upright; that he was tried, and in that trial he fell from God, and that his fall was replete with moral and physical consequences which we can only proximately estimate; that every present evil, and all the deep rooted and radical corruption of our moral nature is the result of that fall; and experi-

ence, attainable, and attained by man corroborates the statement of Bible history and perfectly agrees with the facts therein set forth. These are truths well authenticated, and they alone can, and they do, satisfactorily account for the physical and moral ills that bear sway in the world.

They tell us, as does the dogmatic teaching of Holy Writ, that all is due to a law of sin, that as a governing, controlling and actuating power, rules the heart and life. Sacred history tells us that after the fall of man, human degeneracy advanced rapidly, and was developed in a kingdom of evil; that "All flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil, continually" (Gen. 6: 5).

The teaching of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, both as to His own Kingdom and its character and fruits, and that of the Kingdom of the Prince of this World is explicit and full; but the earlier record as to the reign of sin is substantially the same. The world, and the Prince of this World, as an antagonistic force, absolutely separate from, and opposed to God, and to His law, is equally manifest in both cases.

What we have, then, on this basis to state is, that the Church is a cardinal moral sequence in historic theism; a necessary result of the existence, personality and character of God, and of the moral constitution of man as created of Him; and, particularly a necessary result of his fall from God, and of moral

trial after that fall; and, as the reasonable subject of God's moral government, responsible to Him for evidence afforded to him. By the power of Divine truth; by the grace and sovereignty of a Personal God, as the dispenser of truth; by the moral and effectual inworking of that truth upon the heart, men, as individuals, are by the evidence and by the belief of it, by the choice of truth and goodness, effectually called and separated to God, as His witnesses. That, upon this principle, and in accordance with a uniform law and procedure of God's moral government, from the earliest ages, some were called out and separated from the disobedient and ungodly, we might properly infer, and certainly conclude; and, in accordance therewith, we are told that, in the days of Seth, men "began to call themselves by," or to "call upon the name of the Lord" (Gen. 4: 26). In either case it is expressive of identification with, and elimination from. Hooker remarks, in reference to another matter, "The thing itself is commonly older than the name given to it;" so also we may conclude that, at this time, such a separation, as a fact previously existent, now became more open and evident, and marked association,—and a separate class.

It is of the highest importance to determine the primary character and being of the Church. We have seen that a Personal God is the object of man's faith, as a creature and as a sinner. This brings before us the fact that a Personal God calls

for a personal and individual faith and individual choice, and action upon evidence given. Thus, the primary and necessary being and original of the Church is found in the individual believer. Elect individuals, as believers upon God are the ἀρχή of the Church; its primary character and being. Such privileged condition is strictly traceable to God's electing love and saving power upon the individual, and to the determinating act of a personal faith, in the individual soul, as a moral agent; and the continuous action of the great God our Saviour in the salvation of men, is, under all evidences, uniform in character. Men are enlightened, justified and saved as individuals; as individuals they are in every age, witnesses for God. Primarily, it may be said, they are God's witnesses by a holy character, separated from the ungodly and unrenewed, by a moral and spiritual separation. So St. Peter says (1 Pet. 2: 9), "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people, that ye should shew forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of darkness unto marvellous light." This moral separation,—a separation both of objective faith, and of subjective character—was of God designed to be a witness for Him. "Ye are My witnesses, saith the Lord, that I am God." This character, this faith, and manner of life are, to the world, a witness bearing for Him.

Regarding the Church from an ante-diluvial stand-point, we are told of Enoch, that "he walked

with God, and was not, for God took him." So, Noah was distinguished. The same characteristic is traceable in our Lord's delineation of His sheep. "My sheep hear My voice, and I know them and they follow Me" (John 10: 27). So of the distinctive position of all His people; it is described as that of "fellowship with the Father and with His Son, Jesus Christ" (1 John 1). It is "by the unity of the faith, and the knowledge of the Son of God" (Eph. 4: 13), that "there is, to us, but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in Him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by Him" (1 Cor. 8: 4, 5, 6). So too of the fact of our personal, individual and direct responsibility to God, in the great hereafter, is distinctly asserted. "No man may redeem his brother, or give to God a ransom for him" (Ps. 49: 7). "We shall every one of us give an account of ourselves to God" (Rom. 14: 12). So our Lord declares, "The Son of man shall come in the glory of His Father, with His angels, and then He shall reward every man according to his works" (Matt. 16: 27). So again He says, "All the churches shall know that I am He that searcheth the hearts and reins, and I will give unto every one of you according to his works" (Rev. 2: 23).

Thus we see that it is a personal election, a personal faith, a personal spiritual fellowship and communion, and a personal accountability, and a personal acceptance of salvation. It has been necessary

to state, and to establish these facts, because, as is well known, the character and authority of the Church, as a corporate body, is so stated as to contravene the teaching of Holy Scripture, and so as to interpose the authority of a corporation between the individual and the Creator and Redeemer.

This erroneous and false statement of the character and position of the Church is exhibited in the partial and subjective treatment of the subject in Mr. Locke's essay in "Lux Mundi." The primary and fundamental conception of the Church is left out of sight, and ignored. We may, in fact, say that is repudiated and denied. The first separation of the obedient from the disobedient, the servants of God from the doers of wickedness, and of which we read in Gen. 3 as having taken place in the days of Seth, cannot be said to have taken place as the organization of a society under law and ritual, as such organization cannot be supposed to have taken place until after the flood, and was not clearly defined, as such, until the inauguration of the Jewish church under Moses, as prophet and lawgiver. The ante-diluvial church existed as an immediate and necessary result of a dualism of character, consequent upon the entrance of sin. It was, strictly, we may consider, upon an individual basis, and as a consequence of moral separation. We may doubtless consider that such individual separation would, under moral and spiritual law, operate upon family life; but, it does

not necessarily follow that the Church was, even so, established as an aggregation of families; on the contrary, we find it stated, as an encouragement to all individuals who were "followers after righteousness," and "seekers of the Lord," "Look unto Abraham your father, and unto Sarah that bare you, for I called him, alone, and blessed him, and increased him" (Is. 51 : 2). St. Paul says, "He was the father of all that believe, though they be not circumcised." So it applies not only to believers among the Jews, but among all nations.

And, if the church was not, in patriarchal days, organized as an aggregation of families, under law and ritual, but, at that stage was only so far developed from individual to family life, it was the development of a select class, or generation, and an elected people, under strictly moral and spiritual law. Under such moral operation and influence, was it God's purpose to develop a national church. "I know Abraham that he will command his children and his household after him, to do justice and judgment, that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which He hath spoken of him" (Gen. 18 : 7). It is only from the days of Abraham that we can trace a social development of the Church, on a family basis, and even then it was so developed on the basis of parental authority, natural affection and the moral law of a holy and pious character. In other words, because God had, from the beginning, invested the father of the family

with just authority to rule his family and household; and, because Abraham was himself governed by the faith and love of God, natural affection for, and his lawful government of his children was directed and controlled by his religious character, as a servant of God. Further than this, duty to God, and duty to his children, under the law of nature, and of Natural Religion required him so to govern them, as a consequence of his own religious knowledge. Such duties, and such relationship was afterwards ratified and enforced by revealed religion, under the Mosaic economy; and, as we find natural religion republished and consolidated in Holy Scripture, so also of family religion (which we may characterize as the nursery of the church as a developed society), was consolidated and made a permanent element of religious duty by incorporation in Holy Scripture,—under the same well defined law of God's moral government. It is further to be considered that the Jewish church was regarded of God Himself, in Holy Scripture, as an aggregation of families, as traced backwards; and, as a society it was organized on this basis. So, too, we may properly consider that the Church of the New Testament, if true to its actual being, and proper ideal, should be an aggregation, or congregation of individual believers; and that personal religious character and profession carries with it responsibility for family religion, as a Christian duty, and characteristic. Nevertheless, it is only true

believers that are members of the church, normally considered, or that have been such in any age; and those only are such in this age, who are in vital union with Christ. Such are they of whom He said, "Ye are the salt of the earth," "Ye are the light of the world" (Matt. 5: 13, 14); and of whom the apostle said, "Ye are lights in the world, holding forth the Word of Life" (Phil. 2: 15, 16).

Also, it is solely because of the presence of such in the visible church, that it has actual power for good, or that it enjoys Christ's presence and promises. Further, it is only on the basis of faith and character, that spiritual gifts, offices, and office power are given to the church, as an organized society. "He gave to the church, first, apostles, secondarily prophets, after that pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying or building up of the body of Christ" (Eph. 4: 11–13; 1 Cor. 12: 27, 28). So also, for the same reason has He made it the custodian, and its officers the teachers of the Word, and the dispensers of the sacraments. In fact, all power for church government, as well as all authority to teach in His name, is upon this basis, viz., that such are, themselves, as individuals, under the teaching and governance of His Word, and of His Holy Spirit. Also, at the same time it is to be noticed that all such officers are held responsible for obedience to "the faithful Word" "as he hath been taught." Under such constitutional

law and government as is plainly laid down in God's Word written as to all that relates to dogma, on the basis of sacred history, the law and the prophets; Holy Scripture, as an organic whole; so, is the character and ruling power of the church defined and limited. The rule and criterion of the church's teaching is definitely and immutably fixed by its great Head; and we may justly apply the words with which the Canon of the New Testament, and of Holy Writ, is closed, as having not only a specific reference to the last communication therein contained, but, as, also, applying to the whole of God's Word written, that it is not to be added to, or taken from.

The Word of the Lord, as Eternal Truth endureth forever.

To sum up what I wish to say as to the being and character of the church, as a moral sequence from Theism, I will now recapitulate what I have hereinbefore stated. Primarily and essentially, the church in its origin and being, as a subjective result of the moral government of God, and of objective Theism, is a necessary result of such evidence and moral government,—of man's moral constitution, and of his condition as a fallen being. The existence of the church is due, under moral law, to a necessary elimination and moral separation to God of the just from the unjust.

Such an elimination must, necessarily, be an individual elimination, as well as a moral one; due in

each case to objective evidence, to God's power, and to man's free agency. The moral power therefore, of the church, from this standpoint must be great. It must, from its character and origin have inherent powers of cohesive unity, in its individual members; but, it is a moral, as distinguished from politic and forensic power; it is individual as distinguished from corporate, in the privileges and immunities which it enjoys from God, in the present, and in the promises and prospects appertaining to it in the eternal future.

It becomes necessary, now, to compare these conclusions with the teaching of "Lux Mundi," as to the faith, the being and the office of the church.

I shall not quote, verbatim, the various passages therein contravening what I regard as scripture teaching upon the several points in which such contraventions are found. First, I will epitomize the teaching aforesaid. In regard (1) to the Faith of the Church, it is a fundamental principle of theism, *i. e.*, sound theism, that God is Eternally One, not only as to His Being, but in His counsels of salvation.

We have considered the principles established by Hooker, from God's Holy Word, and sound reason, as to the Law Eternal, primary and secondary, of God's Being and moral government. We may epitomize it thus,—"The Word of the Lord endureth forever." "With Him is no variableness, nor shadow of turning." "Jesus Christ, the same,

yesterday, to-day and forever." This is the Scripture position.

In opposition to the immutability of God, and of objective faith, to which the Church stands, individually, personally and subjectively related; and also, it may be said, in opposition to the relation of the Church, collectively and corporately considered, as it is constituted of God a "witness and keeper of Holy Writ;" as the authors of "Lux Mundi" have accepted the theory of evolution fully and absolutely, and specially as applied to theology, they have identified philosophic truth and scientific discoveries with the supernatural revelations of Holy Writ, and they state that there is an actual "fusion" between them.

So, also, they assert that there is an "ever varying mutation" in the objects, or rather aspects of the Church's faith, so at least that it can adapt its statements of truth to the ever advancing evolution of science,—which it honors as Divine revelations, and to such an extent as to radically alter and to cast discredit upon fundamental truths, dogmatic and historical, of Holy Writ.

It is, thus, no longer the duty of the Church, as witness to, and educator of the world to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered unto the saints" (Jude 3). Nor as our ordinal states, as the office and duty of the ministry to "drive away erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word," but so readily to adjust its statements, and so skillfully

to change its front, in harmony with the evolutions of science, "that the faith it holds forth to the world shall be the faith of to-day." See pp. 12, 31–33, 36 and 37 of "Lux Mundi." Also, faith is treated as quite apart from its objective source in evidence, whether in nature, or in Holy Scripture. It is regarded as a subjective quality,—solely,—capable of ever-advancing evolution, "of a development of which we cannot fix the limits!" This is framed so as to answer, subjectively, to the objective and philosophic knowledge, which is constantly advancing, and is made (actually) to supersede God's written Word. (2) As to the being of the Church. The theology of "Lux Mundi" knows of the Church, only as a corporate body; a judicial Church, rather than a spiritual body. As such, it is characterized as receiving corporate rather than individual benefits, and conveying sacramental grace, as through a divinely appointed channel, rather than the spiritual benefits resulting, through the work of the Holy Ghost upon the ministry and teaching of God's Holy Word. Further,—here, as elsewhere, the argument stating the character of the Church is subjective and philosophical, rather than objective and historical, and from the standpoint of theistic and Bible teaching. (3) By the teaching of "Lux Mundi," inspiration is to be regarded as in the church. Holy Scripture is not the absolute and final test of truth. Here be it noted "Lux Mundi" is directly at variance with the

authoritative declaration of the Sixth Article of our church, as to the "sufficiency of the Holy Scripture." The Scripture is indeed included in the church, but its authority is subordinate to the church. Bishop Gore's language is such that, if fairly and plainly stated, it denies all claim of the Bible to credence as an authentic record of facts, or as historically true. The whole book may be said to show an aversion to supernatural truth. It also teaches that by the action of the Church, the sphere of individual and private judgment is to be, by it, defined and limited. It asserts broadly the Church's power to bind and to loose.

In regard to scientific criticism Bishop Gore believes that "the developments of moderm criticism are reaching results as sure, where it is fairly used, as scientific enquiry."

His own statements, and those of his coadjutors, are such as involve nothing less than the truth and honesty of the sacred writers; nothing less than denial of the perfect human knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and of His plenary knowledge and authority as Messiah and as Prophet; and even an irreverent attack upon the personal character of our Lord and Master, in His human nature, is implied, if not expressed. The aforesaid does by no means exhaust the charges to which the teaching of "Lux Mundi" is open.

The theodicy it "evolves" would revolutionize the theology of the Christian Church; of all that

has been held by the piety and learning of more than nineteen hundred years to be Biblical and true. It would leave Christianity existent only in name; without logical or historical antecedents or foundation.

Herein I have had regard solely to the character and being of the Church, and but incidentally to its office, as a developed organization under law and ritual. I purpose more fully to consider its relation to sacred history, and sacred literature, hereafter. It may, therefore, suffice, now, to say that the unwritten traditions of such a body of believers, as we have found the Church in its normal character and being to be composed of, would in themselves considered secure a dissemination of the facts pertaining to theism, by way of vocal utterance and testimony; and the same operative causes securing the efficacy of unwritten traditions, in relation to theism, secure also, the preservation, inerrancy, and effectual transmission of whatever monumental or documentary evidence might, by the unerring government of a personal God, be adopted and used in that supernatural society so elected and organized by Him for their due preservation as sacred history; also, that being so characterized and preserved, they exist and are perpetuated as a distinctly supernatural and theistic economy, to make known the facts of that history, and also the consolidated and established laws of Jehovah, for the guidance and government of nations, of societies and of individual men.

(The sources of Sacred History, ante and post-diluvial, and the inspiration of Holy Scripture, will form subjects of special consideration when we treat of Theism under Supernatural Law.)

CHAPTER VI

SACRED TRADITIONS, AS AN ELEMENT OF THEISM

HAVING considered the nature and being of the Church, as it is a moral sequence from man's relation to God, as a fallen being under probation, the next subject, in order of logical relation to the premises, is the subject of Divine tradition. This, also, is a sequence from the primary fact of Creation and the Fall.

As the existence of the Church is a moral sequence from the evidence so established, so also is the result of that existence the moral necessity that vocal testimony for God should issue from the Church, as so existent,—both from its being and character and, also, from the character and government of God.

I propose to deal with the topics of the cumulative character of theistic evidence, as a distinct consideration; but it is pertinent here to refer to the fact of the fixed and permanent character of all evidences for God, as they are objective in character, with the results accruing therefrom; and, as they are made permanent in a written, cumulative, and perfectly developed supernatural law. This fact has its original in "the first law eternal" of the Divine Being, and, as it is, so, necessary to the

Being of God, it is fundamental to Objective Theism, both as it proceeds from Him and witnesses to Him. And this feature of Objective Theism is fully declared and maintained in Holy Scripture.

I wish also to emphasize the fact that this principle of theism, as it is fundamental and universal, and as it is maintained in Holy Scripture, is in direct antithesis to the subjective, philosophic principles set forth in "Lux Mundi." As the most dangerous errors are those which are corruptions of some Divine truth, so it is in relation to the subject of Tradition. It is of prime consequence to distinguish between ecclesiastical and Divine traditions,—properly so called. Divine traditions are those which can claim directly and immediately, Divine sanction, either from Holy Scripture itself, or from necessary historical inference antecedent to the publication of Holy Scripture.

It is of the latter that I now proceed to speak. Upon the basis of historical facts of Creation and Providence, as related to a Personal Creator,—as we accept the Bible account, in the first book of Moses, as to ante-diluvial history,—we learn that man's longevity, in the early history of the race, was such that, for a long period subsequent to the Fall, and we may conceive even to the time of the Deluge, the memory of living men would sufficiently preserve the salient facts in the history of our fellow-men, and of God's dealings, as Creator, with them.

Coupled with this we may place the fact of the natural tendency of mankind to perpetuate records of facts of interest, and facts of history. Thus we may reasonably infer that some additional and tangible records and evidences, whatever might be their form, substantiated the traditional facts, and that they were, so, preserved.

We may, here, give as an illustration, the pillar and heap of stones raised by Laban and Jacob, as a memorial; so also Absalom's pillar "to keep his name in remembrance;" but coupled with the above, we must place the witness-bearing character of a living church, as composed of individual believers upon God; themselves witnesses, by electing grace. Separated in character from the rest of mankind, they would be, in themselves considered, the natural, necessary and fitting witnesses of God, and for the facts of His government, providence and care. This inference from the premises, as logical and just, is substantiated by subsequent and specific teaching of Holy Scripture, as afterwards given for human guidance.

By such evidence we are fortified even to certitude in our conclusions, as to the fact, the source and the reliability of the evidence presented, as historical facts, to our reasonable faith.

Hence, the traditions we are now contemplating are not the traditions of the Church as a corporate ecclesiastical body, as ultimately developed at a later age of the world's history, and comprehending the

false and the true, subjectively considered, but the traditions and witness-bearing of elect, spiritual and true witnesses, whose fidelity and capacity for such witness bearing is justly worthy of our acceptance, as a Divine provision and appointment, although under the natural operation of moral and spiritual law. Further, we are fortified in our conclusion by the subsequent dogmatic teaching of Holy Scripture as to the office of the Church, primarily considered, as consisting of individual believers; and afterwards as a body under law, as a permanent element in His moral government of mankind, operative as such in all ages, and in all lands where His revealed will is known. As then the traditions we are considering are, primarily and immediately considered, Divine traditions, and as they are, mediately considered, the witnessing act of believing men, so they may be said to comprehend and include historic facts of Theism, and subjective facts of personal and internal experience of Divine power, and of Religious truth. The one has a specific reference to man as a creature; the other has reference to man as he is a fallen being, and as he is a sinner. Having noticed the permanency of all Theistic evidences, as elements of the Divine Government, I may here direct attention to the twofold aspect of what may, in both instances, be termed traditions of the Church, as it is regarded in its normal and necessary character; *i. e.*, as a living church.

The traditionary witnessing and testimony of the

Church as to the historic facts of Theism, and we may say, also, as to objective truth, in general, of a Theistic character had, in the earlier ages, a very evident as well as a very wide sphere of operation. The Church when organized and developed under the Mosaic economy was, still, a witnessing body to many nations; and the oral, historic traditions of Theism, as to facts of past ages, were but corroborated by dogmatic testimony, and by the formulated ritual of the Church, as a religious society representing a developed Theism; while, accompanying vocal testimony, and inspired revelation, and Divine organization, a moral force of subjective character, and experience was declared, in various measures, and degrees, to sustain and to verify the objective evidences.

In fact we may say that the great missionary charge given by our Lord to the Church of the New Testament, did but republish, though with intensified power by reason of the ultimate and perfected historic testimony, a fundamental and necessary element of Theism; that is, a testimony, vocal and moral, for God, from believing man to his fellowmen.

We may also consider that the prophetic office, regarded in its human aspect, does but represent the development, in official form and in a public sphere, of the social aspect of the same principle, *i. e.*, the testimony and declaration from man to men of the character and operation, as well as of the revealed Will of God.

In regard to the pervading influence of this element of Theism, it is to be noticed that, as a confession, and testimony is everywhere in God's Word set forth as a practical duty, so also, that tradition as here regarded, and as distinctively Divine, presents both a family and social, and a national and public aspect.

First, in regard to parental traditions. The inferences that we draw from the primary facts, the attendant circumstances, and from moral and spiritual law, are, as I have said, fortified by subsequent teaching of Holy Scripture, and by oblique references to such facts, inferences and dogmatic precepts. The following quotations are sufficient to illustrate, as to confirm these conclusions, and justify us in the belief that they refer to a generally recognized law, universally operative.

So Hezekiah says (Is. 38 : 19), "The living, the living, he shall praise Thee, as I do this day; the fathers to the children shall make known Thy truth." So, in like manner, Moses, in his song (Deut. 32 : 6, 8), "Remember the days of old, consider the years of many generations, ask thy father, and he shall shew thee; thine elders and they will tell thee." So David says (Ps. 44 : 1), "We have heard with our ears, O God, our fathers have told us what Thou didst in their days, in the times of old." Specially pointed is the teaching of Ps. 78 : 1–8. "Give ear O my people to my law, incline your ears to the words of my mouth. I will open

my mouth in a parable. I will declare dark sayings of old, which we have heard and known, and our fathers have told us. We will not hide them from the children of the generation to come, the praises of the Lord and His strength and His wonderful works which He hath done."

I have quoted the above passages referring to the fact of such oral testimony; in other passages to which I will refer, we read of a dogmatic precept, and command, that such oral testimony should be given—primarily, and specially from father to children; so the verses that follow refer to this commandment, and connect fact with precept.

(From what passages I shall hereafter adduce, we may see that confession of Jehovah to surrounding nations was, also, set forth to them as a moral obligation, as well as a definite precept.)

"For, He commanded a testimony in Jacob, and appointed a law in Israel, which He commanded our fathers that they should make them known to their children; that the generation to come might know them, even the children which should be born; who should arise and declare them to their children; that they might set their hope in God, and not forget the works of God, but keep His commandments. In Exodus 12: 26, 27; 13: 8, and 14: 15, it is anticipated that enquiry would be made by the son from the father, as to the reason for the Passover, and for the precepts and commandments,

generally; and, so, special commands are given for such oral teaching, its occasion, character and the benefits accruing, viz., as being "for our good alway, and it shall be our righteousness, if we observe to do all these statutes before the Lord our God, as He hath commanded us" (Deut. 6: 20–25).

I have distinguished between the actual fact and the dogmatic precept of the Most High, by which the perpetuity, and authority of sacred traditions was, subsequently, established and secured. I will now quote a passage by which their origin is traceable to a plan and purpose of God's moral government, as it was afterwards ratified by Divine precept. "And that thou mayest tell in the ears of thy son, and of thy son's son what things I have done in Egypt, and My signs which I have done among them; that ye may know that I am the Lord" (Ex. 10: 1, 2). We may now quote the direct precept by which this was followed. "And it shall come to pass, when your children shall say unto you, What mean ye by this service? Ye shall say, It is the sacrifice of the Lord's Passover, who passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt when He smote the Egyptians and delivered our houses. And the people bowed their heads and worshipped" (Ex. 12: 26, 27). Again, "And thou shalt shew thy son in that day, saying, This is done because of that which the Lord did to me when I came forth out of Egypt. And it shall be when

thy son asketh thee in time to come, saying, What is this? that thou shalt say unto him, By strength of hand the Lord brought us out from Egypt, from the house of bondage; And it came to pass, when Pharaoh would hardly let us go, that the Lord slew all the first-born in the land of Egypt, both the first-born of man, and the first-born of beasts; therefore, I sacrifice to the Lord all that openeth the matrix, being males; and all the first-born of my children, I redeem" (Ex. 13: 8, 14, 15). But in Deut. 11: 18, 19, such injunction and precept was applied to all the Mosaic law. "Therefore, shall ye lay up these My words in your heart and in your soul, and bind them for a sign upon your hands, that they may be as frontlets between your eyes. And ye shall teach them your children, speaking of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, when thou liest down and when thou risest up." That it was the purpose of God that such testimony and tradition was also to benefit surrounding nations; and, moreover, that it was a duty, obligatory upon them, so to testify unto them what it was their first duty to declare unto their children, the following passages are evidence. In Ps. 96: 3–10 we read, "Tell it out among the heathen, or nations (Goūn) that the Lord is King, and that He hath made the round world so sure that it cannot be moved, and how that He shall judge the people righteously." It is noteworthy that in this passage the matters of tes-

timony to be given are the primary facts of Jehovah as Creator, and Jehovah as the righteous Judge of the world; and that these, as primary truths, it was their special duty to testify and declare.

As to the general truth of the fact that such traditions did reach and influence surrounding nations, and that the salient facts of Jewish history were so set forth to them in evidence, other passages bear record. Thus; the Gibeonites assigned as the reason of their policy in feigning to be ambassadors, that they were aware of the Lord's command to Moses, to put the inhabitants of Canaan to death. And Rahab told the spies that the people of Jericho had heard how the Lord dried up the waters of the Red Sea before them; also, of what He had done to Sihon and Og, the two kings of the Amorites, that were on the other side Jordan; that the Lord had given them the land and that their terror was fallen upon the inhabitants (Joshua 2: 8–12). Also, we learn from Ex. 18: 1, that Jethro had, similarly, heard of all that God had done for Moses, and for Israel His people. But,—not only do we learn of these facts of sacred traditions reaching heathen nations, and also that the Israelites were charged with a duty in this particular, but we also learn from Deut. 4: 6–8, that they were taught to consider the influence that their conduct, in general, would have upon those nations. "This is your wisdom and understanding in the sight of the nations which shall hear all

these statutes and say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people."

Further, the plan and purpose of God in relation to the nations at large, and in relation to the Jews as custodians of His truth is incidentally manifested by various utterances in the Psalms and in the Prophets. In the thirty-sixth chapter of the prophecy of Ezekiel, the twentieth and twenty-first verses, Jehovah charges the Jews with the fact that they had profaned His holy name among the heathen whither they went.

The same charge is repeated in the twenty-second and twenty-third verses. In the twentieth chapter at the ninth and fourteenth verses, He declares that He, Jehovah, Himself wrought for His holy name that it should not be polluted before the heathen among whom they were, in whose sight He made Himself known unto them, in bringing them forth out of the land of Egypt. And, again, in the fourteenth verse, He declares that, notwithstanding their rebellion against Him in the wilderness, He wrought for His name's sake that it should not be polluted before the heathen, in whose sight He brought them out.

In the thirty-sixth chapter and thirty-first verse; in the thirty-seventh chapter and twenty-eighth verse, and also in the thirty-ninth chapter and twenty-third verse, He declares, (1) "The heathen that are left round about you shall know that I, the Lord, build the ruined places, and plant that that is

desolate;" and (2) "The heathen shall know that I, the Lord, do sanctify Israel, when My sanctuary shall be in the midst of them forevermore;" and (3) "The heathen shall know that the house of Israel went into captivity for their iniquity; because they trespassed against Me, therefore I hid My face from them and gave them into the hand of the enemies; so fell they all by the sword" (Ez. 39 : 23).

To the same effect is the language of Psalm 98: 3, "The Lord declared His salvation; His righteousness hath He openly shewed in the sight of the nations; He hath remembered His mercy and truth towards the house of Israel; all the ends of the earth have seen the salvation of our God." The above passages, with others I will now quote, constitute some of those indirect references to this element of Theism, similar in character to that which is made in Holy Scripture in regard to others, as well as to historic facts, in general, of the Old Testament. Thus Deut. 4: 22, "For ask now of the days that are past, since the day that God created man upon the earth; and ask from the one end of heaven to the other, whether there hath been any such thing as this great thing is, or hath been heard like it?" And Deut. 32: 7, "Remember the days of old, consider the years of many generations; ask thy father and he will shew thee; thy elders and they will tell thee." So, Job 8 : 8, "For, enquire I pray thee of the former age, and

prepare thyself to the search of thy fathers." And Job 15 : 9, 10, "What knowest thou that we know not? What understandest thou that is not in us? With us are the gray-headed and very aged men, much elder than thy father." Also, verses seventeen, eighteen, nineteen, "I will shew thee, hear me; and that which I have seen will I declare; which wise men have told from their fathers, and have not hid it; unto whom alone the earth was given and no strangers passed among them." Again, Chapter 20 : 4, 5, "Knowest thou not this of old, since man was placed upon the earth, that the triumphing of the wicked is short, and the joy of the impious man is but for a moment." Also, Ps. 135 : 13, "Thy name O Jehovah endureth forever; and Thy memorial O Jehovah throughout all generations." And Ps. 145 : 4, "One generation shall praise Thy works to another, and shall declare Thy mighty acts. I will speak of the glorious honor of Thy majesty and of Thy wondrous works. And men shall speak of the might of Thy terrible acts; and I will tell of Thy greatness. They shall abundantly utter the memory of Thy great goodness, and shall tell of Thy righteousness. They shall speak of the glory of Thy kingdom and talk of Thy power; to make known to the sons of men His mighty acts, and the glorious majesty of His kingdom." So Ps. 79 : 14, "So we Thy people and sheep of Thy pasture shall give Thee thanks forever; and will ever be shewing Thy truth from

generation to generation."[1] So Joel 1 : 2, 3, "Hear this, ye old men, and give ear, all ye inhabitants of the land. Hath this been in your day ? or even in the days of your fathers ? Tell your children of it, and let your children tell their children, and their children another generation."

This does not exhaust the evidence that is indirect, and oblique; and for that reason is axiomatic. To the above quotations may be added Ps. 44 : 1, 2; Ps. 19; Ps. 67 : 1, 2; Ps. 71 : 18; Ps. 96 : 3–10; Ps. 97 : 6; Ps. 98 : 2, 3; Ps. 102 : 18; Ps. 33 : 11; Ps. 15 : 10, 18.

It is very evident that the Prophet Joel, in the passage quoted, as well as many of the Old Testament writers, makes use of a known and established practice and method of communication to emphasize, as well as to illustrate, the message conveyed and the truth declared.

This primitive practice, as a part of the Divine economy is, by God's Holy Spirit, utilized as a pertinent, and as a well-known fact for this purpose, as it is so incorporated and bound up with His Holy Word. But, such evidence when a written and inspired law was promulgated and declared,

[1] The phrase "generation to generation," or "in all generations," and the like, is frequently used in the Old Testament Scripture, and is, everywhere, to be regarded as a reference to Sacred Tradition, either in their family or national aspect and relationship. This goes to shew how completely this primary element of Theism possessed the thoughts, and was incorporated in the life and history of God's ancient people.

was not only, so, consolidated, and as an element of Theism perpetuated; it was also developed and extended. As representing the testimony of believing men, under moral and spiritual law of God's government, and as representing their individual experience, as a subjective result of God's power and truth, we may quote Ps. 66: 16, "O come hither and hear, all ye that fear God, and I will declare what He hath done for my soul."

We may also consider that, cognate in character is the corporate confession of the Church of the same fact of God's truth and salvation; and that there is an indirect reference to this established usage and recognized element of Theism when St. Paul says in 1 Tim 1: 15, "This is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." In like manner in Titus 3: 8, St. Paul affirms "This is a faithful saying, and these things will I that thou affirm constantly that they which have believed in God be careful to maintain good works. These things are good and profitable unto men." So also in 2 Tim. 2: 11 he says "It is a faithful saying, for if we be dead with Him, we shall also live with Him; if we suffer we shall also reign with Him; if we deny Him, He also will deny us; if we believe not, He abideth faithful; He cannot deny Himself." To this he adds, "Of these things, put them in remembrance."

Again in 2 Thess. 3: 6, he says of some that they

walk "not according to the traditions which he received of us." It is evident that,—here,—the reference of the apostle is to his own oral teaching. Elsewhere he says, with the same reference, "Whether by word, or our epistle" (2 Thess. 2 : 15). It is noticeable, here, that in the case of oral teaching, Divinely enjoined, of the fathers to the children, that testimony which at first was spontaneous, and grounded upon a principle native to our common humanity, but which, under Divine guidance, and the influence of a Divine faith, became also a spiritual characteristic, as well as a Divine ordinance, passed from a spontaneous and natural disposition to a settled principle of the Divine economy, as a dogmatic principle and commandment.

We can at least say of the office of the preacher and of preaching as a Divine ordinance, that it is cognate, if not identical, both in its origin and primary character, with Divine tradition. We trace, however, a distinction, in that traditional testimony which belongs to the believer upon God, and that which is general in its operation and character; and so, yet more specifically of that oral teaching or tradition peculiar to the Apostolate, as official teachers and messengers of the Most High.

In either case, this traditional teaching is Divine, as distinguished from human, both in its original and in its character and authority, and, in Holy Scripture, stands contrasted with "the traditions of

men,"—merely—both in the teaching of St. Paul, and in that of our Saviour Himself, in regard to rabbinical traditions.

Also another instance is afforded, by this subject, to illustrate the relation between natural and supra-natural, or revealed religion. It is the necessary and close relationship of the foundation to the superstructure. There is homogeneity of character, and perfect unity of relation.

These considerations go to show the distinctive character, and the impregnable basis of Divine tradition, as an elementary principle of Biblical Theism, and as an integral part thereof. In common with all the elements of natural religion, it is consolidated in, and identified with Holy Scripture, as essentially Divine; and it is radically separate from the traditions of men,—merely,—whether in regard to things secular, or to things ecclesiastical.

Hence, all traditions, of whatever character, or from wheresoever derived, and even although presented by the corporate authority of the Church, as a Divinely instituted organization, is essentially subordinate to, and must be tried by the one Divine rule of Holy Scripture as the final test of all that claims Divine sanction or authority; neither can any ecclesiastical corporation take away the individual right of private judgment, in the interpretation of Holy Writ which is secured to him therein and thereby; as, for the exercise of such freedom he is, by the same law, made individually responsi-

ble to God, only; that is to say, as he is an individual, and not an official member of the Church, and so related thereto. The evidence is, I think, established that by God's works in nature, in providence, and in the human conscience, we have a primary, powerful, and sufficient witness to the fact of a personal and perfect First-Cause as Creator of the universe; and, as related to this fact, requiring from man by reason of such evidence, his faith in, and obedience to Him; it is now to be considered that this has not, from a very early period, been the sole evidence. The direct, immediate, historic knowledge of Paradise and of the Fall, would go down as facts, from Adam to his immediate descendants. The murder of Abel, and the curse of Cain would be equally patent, as facts in evidence. The direct supernatural messages and communications from God to men, to which more full and particular reference will hereafter be made, would be equally well established as facts of history; and all these further fortified by the mediate and subjective agency and testimony of those who had become subjects of God's moral government by faith and obedience. The vocal and personal testimony of believers would continuously preserve and reecho these facts in evidence, from generation to generation; and we may conclude that by a natural process of moral and spiritual law, the means and avenues of knowledge of God were sufficiently available to all who did not, culpably, by negli-

gence, or willfulness close their eyes and their hearts to its influences. These considerations serve, further, to declare the deadly and terrible character of sin, as a law inherited by man, after the Fall, dominating his moral nature, and blinding, controlling and possessing, under Satanic influences, the hearts and lives of the great majority; not by unavoidable, or physical necessity, but by the guilty and inexcusable character of depraved and wicked choice, against light, evidence and conviction, concerning God, as a God of goodness, as well as a God of truth. There is not room to doubt that the same principle of condemnation obtained then, as was declared at a later period by our Lord, under—it is true—a far more effulgent, but not necessarily a more effective light; "This is the condemnation that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness, rather than light, because their deeds were evil." The conclusions resulting from the evidence in regard to tradition afford a substantial basis for both general and particular inferences. (1) General,—in regard to Theism, as a whole. As the natural evidences, objective and subjective, are Divinely correlated to each other, and unified in co-operative testimony to Him who is their Author, so, also, are natural and supra-natural evidences so correlated and unified. While the several lines of evidence are clearly marked, so that they are not fused with each other, or evolved one from the other, they are so interwoven with each other that

they are perfectly unified both in character and operation. They evidence a Divinely ordered cumulation of a distinctive character and purpose, in harmonious operation to a definite end. In such cumulative progression, man's distinctive ontological character and moral nature, as witnessed to by the creative power and providence of God, is made the unalterable and stable basis. God, as Creator; and Man, as His handiwork, are the two great factors in evidence; and, in the consolidation of that primary evidence, the Divine transcendency is further magnified in the operation of His moral government. The supra-natural in Theistic evidence is clearly manifested as one in character, in relation to origin, with the natural; and as an instance only, it may be observed that, in selecting and qualifying those who were to bear the ultimate and final revelation of His character and will to men, in a written, spiritual and infallible rule of truth and duty, as summarizing, consolidating and unifying all the evidences of Himself in a Divine Complementum; He adopted and used, as He consecrated and directed the very idiosyncrasies of their human nature, circumstances and surroundings; while He made their thoughts, and their utterances, peculiarly His own, as the expression of His counsel and will.

(2) In regard to the particular subject before us, it is clearly true that we have ample evidence to justify us in the acceptance of a clear and definite principle in regard to Divine tradition as an element

of Theism; (*a*) that God has made the faculties of thought and language, and the social habits, and desires of our common humanity to be a fitting instrumentality by which to transmit from one generation of men to another a record of the facts of His providence and government in the world; and, while this principle holds good as a universal truth in regard to the historical facts of His providence and government, it has (*b*) a further and special verification in regard to the witness-bearing and testimony of those, who by faith and obedience, have obtained knowledge of Him, by personal and special experience of His character. To such, a witness-bearing for Him is made not only a spiritual and distinctive characteristic; but, by a Divine command, it has become, to them a special and peculiar duty; this we have already noticed.

In summarizing our conclusion from the evidence, I would say that there is reason to conclude that, as God has consolidated and developed other of the elements of His moral government,—so, has He consolidated and developed that of Sacred Tradition, by a cumulative, and culminatory process of development, as opposed to an evolutionary process. The distinctive element is not abolished nor superseded; it is developed and consolidated, as an integral part of one great whole; and, as the written and inspired Word is the Complementum of Theism, uniting all its elements in one organic whole, while preserving to each its distinctive character,—so is this principle

maintained and exemplified in the case of Sacred Tradition. In a similar way to that by which all the Books of Holy Scripture are, so, unified and consolidated, *i. e.*, both by specific and by oblique testimony to each other; by literal quotation, and by indirect reference (which, as it is permeative and collateral is the most powerful testimony), so is it true as to tradition. There is a constant reference to it, as an axiomatic fact; and, further than this, not only has this tendency of our ontological nature been utilized by our great Creator to the ends of His moral government, but, this primary principle has been extended and developed,—not only by distinct precept, but to extended methods and uses. In evidence of this I quote the words of St. Paul in 2 Thess. 2: 15, "Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle." Again in 2 Thess. 5 : 6, "Now we command you brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly and not after the traditions which he received of us." The evidence afforded by Holy Scripture justifies the following deductions; (1) That the terms Tradition, or "Saying," as a Scripture phrase, declares oral testimony to an actual and reliable fact; (2) That such oral testimony is the testimony of believing men; (3) That it has the seal of Divine approval and authority, as emanating from Him; (4) That such testimony is cumulative, and culminatory

in character; and in such ultimate use and expression, the phrase describes both oral teaching and testimony by a Divine messenger, and also the ultimate and inspired testimony of Holy Scripture itself, with which it is unified and into which it is, finally, merged.

I think that we are amply justified in concluding that, as by a general principle, the revelation of God, in Holy Scripture is of a cumulative and culminatory character, as contrasted with that of evolution (in which the previous portions are superseded by, and merged in what succeeds them) so, that the primary and initial uses of Divine tradition, anterior to inspiration of a written record, are not superseded by, or in that record; yet, nevertheless such initial and oral tradition retains its distinctive force and value for us both in the past and in the present, as an element of God's moral government, and as a revelation from Him; and that while it is, so, perpetuated, as a Theistic element, it is made cumulative, and culminatory in its character as it is incorporated in the completed Canon of the Old and New Testament, as the Complementum, or fullness of God's revelation of Himself. It is, here, I think, pertinent and apposite to quote the language of St. John, in the 19th chapter, and part of the 19th verse of his apocalypse. "And He said unto me, these are the true sayings of God." Also I would notice that, in the last chapter, the same use is made of the word, "sayings,"—"sayings of the prophecy

of this Book," in which the reference, in this last revelation of God to His Church, to the principle of Sacred Traditions, and testimony for God, is peculiarily solemn and noteworthy. Thus—so far from the primary element of Sacred Tradition having fallen into disuse, or been superseded by subsequent revelations, it has been, in the plan of God's government, both perpetuated and consolidated in Holy Scripture. It remains to state, briefly, the relation of this subject to "Lux Mundi," and the "Higher Criticism." This is declared, by themselves, to be that of an issue between tradition and philosophy, or science, as its equivalent. They, themselves, identify the Bible with Sacred Tradition, as one in character and origin, but they reject all that, in the Bible, so distinguishes it from philosophy, and they would fuse philosophy with the supra-natural, or traditional element, in order to purify it from immorality! Why would they so fuse it? Because they recognize that tradition (or the Divine supernatural) antagonizes philosophy, or, the theory of evolution, as they propound it; and as, with them, a first and essential element of truth, both objective and subjective.

Let us, first, notice that, in so doing, they are logically required to renounce Theism altogether; seeing that the distinctive principle of Theism is to be abolished, or, nullified by its fusion with philosophy. But, there is not,—nor can be,—any fusion possible between Tradition and Theism as a

supra-natural element,—and philosophy; there is not,—nor can be,—any homogeneity between them, either objectively, as systems, or subjectively, as governing, and actuating principles of life and conduct. And, as there is no inherent homogeneity, therefore they cannot be fused together, so as through "Evolution by antagonism," to purify, or eliminate, the distinctive element in Theism which they characterize as "immoral"! And, as I deny, that there is any actual homogeneity between Theism, or the worship of one living and true God (whether viewed objectively or subjectively) and the worship of false gods, represented by the various false systems of religion (and such homogeneity is asserted by "Lux Mundi"); so do I, also, deny that there can be any fusion possible, because there is no homogeneity between the principles of natural science, or philosophy, and the distinctively spiritual, because Divine truth, characterizing God's Holy Word, and that worship of the living and true God which is based upon it. But, it is to be remarked that such homogeneity is here, also, asserted by "Lux Mundi." All truth of whatever kind is put on the same footing; and as a consequence, all inspiration in the proper and theistic sense of the word, is flatly denied. On the other hand,—as to the issue between Biblical Tradition and philosophic criticism of the Bible,—Sacred Traditions are,—as I have hereinbefore shewn,—entirely homogeneous with elementary Theism, from

the concurrent testimony both of the works, and of the Word of God.

Synopsis of Chapter VI

Sacred Traditions as a Biblical Element: Inferential argument therefrom (1) as to natural evidences, (2) as to supernatural evidences or sacred history.

Biblical theists are assailed at the threshold of the theistic argument by an anti-theistic attack upon the character and the foundations of the whole Bible. This attack consists in a denial of the traditional basis upon which it rests. They wish to abolish its distinctive character as a sacred Book, and that, both in its historical and in its doctrinal aspects. First, it has been asserted, but not proved, that the Bible contradicts the ascertained facts of science and natural law. Their second assertion consists in a virtual, but a thinly disguised denial, in toto, of its distinctive character and origin, as a whole, and as an inspired and sacred record. We may here recapitulate our previous conclusions.

(1) As to the intrinsic evidences, contained in nature, to the Being of God, as Creator, and the concurrent testimony contained in the Bible, in relation thereto, and as to the unification of natural and supernatural evidences therein.

(2) Our second conclusion has been as to a similar result from a study of the subjective side of the evidences; and that God is, so, knowable from the evidences contained in objective nature.

From both of these sides of the evidence we have learned the essential unity, so established, between natural and supernatural religion, and that the Bible is cumulative and culminatory evidence for God, upon this basis, *i. e.*, the testimony of objective nature to the existence and personality of God.

Our third and fourth chapters do but amplify this evidence by consideration of the Personality and Providence of God, as related thereto.

Our sixth chapter deals with sacred tradition, as a necessary sequence from the existence of the Church; as the Church is such a sequence from (*a*) objective theism, and (*b*) from the probation of man, as a sinner. Sacred traditions, similarly, are a characteristic and a consequence of the nature of the Church, in its elementary character, as a confessing, or testifying body.

The fact is established that, as Biblical theism discloses the unification of Natural and Revealed Religion, and, also, that sacred traditions, as they permeate and pervade the whole of the Bible, are, as an element of theism, perpetuated and consolidated in the New Testament. We have, thus, a logical proof that the unity of Natural and Supernatural Religion, so established, and the unity, as

well as the cumulative and culminatory character of the Bible as a whole, establishes the fact, and also the Divine authority of sacred tradition, (1) as it relates to creation, and primitive man, and (2) as to the essential character and the Divine sources of all the inspired writings of which the Bible is composed.

We may, now, observe how gratuitous and illogical from a theistic standpoint, is the assertion that the books of the Old Testament are to be regarded, simply, as Jewish literature. To do this is to ignore, if not to deny the essential unity between Natural and Revealed Religion and the books of the Old Testament, but, inferentially, to deny the basis of both, *i. e.*, the personality of God.

Objective nature, as has been proved, bears inherent testimony to God as First-Cause and Creator; the books of the Old Testament bear similar inherent testimony to Him as such, and to the essential unity between Natural and Revealed Religion.

The Pentateuch gives us consistent, credible and inherent testimony to the fact, not alone of creation as the act of God,—and to the facts of man's history upon the earth from that time onwards,—but, it gives a statement of the fact that God as Creator and Governor of the world, after the flood, as a consequence of man's fall from Him, and of prevailing iniquity, chose one man, Abraham and his posterity, to be a separate people in the earth to His name, and that " to them He committed the

oracles of God"; that is to say, a written and inspired law contained in the five books of Moses, and that of these books, as of His religion, He made them custodians and witnesses to the world for Him (Is. 43 : 10–12). This is the consistent, logical, conclusive and credible evidence that is afforded to us through the Jewish church, as founded of God, and through its accredited and Divine traditions, not merely, or simply of their history, as a people, but the history of the world, and of man, and of God as related thereto, and a history that is essentially sacred and Divine, both in its origin and character, and designed and provided of God as a Divine and certain light to guide all men to the knowledge of His character and will.

Summary,—

(1) There is intrinsic evidence in Holy Scripture as to the solidarity and perpetuity of sacred traditions, as a Divine law embodied therein. This fact is so established.

(2) From the evidence so afforded we find that the Bible, as a Divine record, is based upon intrinsic evidences contained in nature, to God as Creator and Moral Governor, and, as such evidence includes man, himself, in the unity of nature.

(3) The natural and logical result of this is, that the Bible, as the Book of God, stands identified, in its origin and composition, with tradition as a Divine law, because of such intrinsic evidence. Thus, also, natural religion and the Bible are bound

up together; they stand or fall together, *i. e.*, either the Bible, as revealed evidence from God, is a God-given book, through sacred tradition, or the whole matter of its testimony, with it, is null and void. The argument thus given shows that the Bible is in its structure, the unification of Natural and Revealed Religion, and in its texture stands identified with sacred tradition; this fact, alone, does in itself, contain complete and logical evidence that the Bible is the Book of God, as it gives similar evidence for the primary and fundamental truth of God as Creator and Moral Governor of the universe. As subsidiary testimony and coherent therewith there is an additional fact that remains to be stated as an important factor in evidence to the character and source of the Pentateuch. We have seen that, upon examination, the whole texture of Scripture is interwoven with sacred tradition; it is now to be noticed that it is, therein, explicitly stated in several places, that the Old Testament Scriptures as sacred books, were delivered to the Jews, through the Patriarchs or Fathers.

St. Paul, in summarizing the privileges possessed by the Jews, asks the question (Rom. 3: 1, 2), "What advantage then hath the Jews? or what profit is there of circumcision?" The answer is, "Much every way; chiefly, that unto them were committed the oracles of God," τα λογια του θεου, or the revelations of, or proceeding from God. Again he says (Rom. 9: 4, 5), "To whom pertaineth the

adoption, and the glory (*i. e.*, Shechniah) and the covenants (Abrahamic and Mosaic), and the giving of the Law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever." Our Lord makes a brief reference of a similar character. "Moses therefore gave unto you circumcision; not because it is of Moses but of the fathers" (John 7: 22). Again, Stephen, when addressing the Jews, stated facts which he knew to be recognized by, as well as familiar to them, as such, in connection with their history; and, speaking of Moses, he says, "This is he that was with the church in the wilderness, with the angel that spake to him in Mount Sinai; and with our fathers; who received the lively oracles to give unto us" (Acts 7: 38). By the expression "our fathers," in this place, is to be understood to Jews who were cotemporaries with Moses; while in the previous quotation is meant the Patriarchs, as seen by the antithesis drawn by our Saviour, pointing to an earlier, and more primitive origin. Confining then the interpretation of this latter passage to Moses, and the giving of the law, we find the communications so spoken of, described as λογια ζων τας, or living communications. Our authorized translation gives us a similar idea. From both phrases we draw the just inference of a distinctive and spiritual character, and, such being the inherent distinction so described, they were, so, re-

ceived of Moses, and by him to be delivered and handed down, as such to the Jewish church. The meaning of Stephen's words is, that they were given, received and handed down as sacred books; as such received by the Jewish church, and as such handed down through them to us, to be so regarded, kept and transmitted. Our Lord, we cannot doubt, refers to this trust when He says, "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof" (Matt. 21 : 43).

The Jews, as is well known, always so regarded all the Old Testament, as sacred books and have jealously kept them. "Our Lord refers to this fact when He says, "Search the Scriptures, ταϛ-γϛαφαϛ for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of Me" (John 5 : 39).

The facts herein referred to are to be regarded as historically coherent with the conclusion established by our main argument; and as a logical as well as necessary sequence therefrom.

CHAPTER VII

PROPHECY AND THE PROPHETIC OFFICE

WE have seen that the Church in its being and character has its origin under conditions fundamental to the Divine government. It is a moral elimination, under moral trial; under the operation of moral and spiritual law; under the personal hand of a righteous, beneficent and sovereign moral governor. We have also seen that the foundations of God's moral government are laid in those manifestations which He has given of His character and being, as Creator and Preserver of men, and in the moral and ontological qualities of our nature, to which that evidence is addressed. These evidences are the broad and universal basis of His claims as moral governor; and to these, in His Holy Word, continual references are made. We are left in no doubt, however, that mankind has, at no stage of human history, been left entirely without immediate manifestations of God's glorious personality, and of His minute superintendence of the affairs of men. The mediate evidence of God, under natural law, has been, and is accompanied by immediate and supra-natural disclosures, ratifying and confirming that evidence.

Our present enquiry is as to the relation of Prophecy and the Prophetic office to the government of God under the economy of natural, as distinguished from revealed religion.

With the primary facts before us, to which I have referred, we are in a position to draw just and reliable inferences in solution of this question; and these are guided and ratified by the historical evidence; I mean, by the recorded witness of Holy Scripture. The statements there made, come to us sustained and commended by objective evidence, and facts of our own consciousness.

Under the guidance of this rule we have already concluded as to the conditions of the Church's being, and the sphere of its influence as a witness for God. We have found it to be in that of individual character and family relation.

Under these formative conditions God was known and declared as the God of the individual, and of the family and household. As a body corporate, the Church was not then organized under law and ritual. Consequently, a similar conclusion is to be drawn in regard to prophecy and the prophetic office. Regarding the existence of the Church as due to conditions of moral probation and the entrance of sin, and as a moral sequence therefrom, we may properly consider that, under such conditions, the supra-natural gift of prophecy, and the office of Prophet, is a further sequence of a similar character; while, at the same time a Divine and a

supra-natural gift to the Church, as so constituted of God. Adam's fall from innocence to the condition of a sinner, although it banished him from Eden and from that near and personal intercourse with God which he previously enjoyed, did not entirely shut him out, or his posterity, from all tokens of God's presence with him, although a sinner. God's expostulatory language to Cain when his offering was not accepted, and "his countenance fell" is evidence of this. "Why art thou angry, and why is thy countenance fallen? If thou doest well shalt thou not be accepted?" After his awful fratricide and when God severely sentenced and punished him, Cain's utterances are very suggestive in regard to this matter. In regard to his spiritual state, before God, there is ground for hope, because such punishment was severely felt. His complaint is not that his punishment was not deserved, but,—it is "greater than I can bear"; and it includes the thought, "from Thy face I shall be hid." We can no otherwise conclude than that it means, "from the manifestation of Thy presence." We infer from this, that, after the Fall, such manifestations of God's personal presence were not wanting,—although we are not told how.

The evidences, so given, of God's wide compassion, love and benevolence to mankind, as sinners, may well assure us of His special presence with, and care of His believing and obedient people; and of a care suited to their spiritual requirements; and, at

the same time, to the furtherance of His own honor and glory thereby, and for the good of mankind at large.

Turning now to the Sacred Record in our enquiry, we find that it is said in Gen. 5 : 24, "And Enoch walked with God, and was not, for God took him." St. Jude supplements this brief statement by telling us that Enoch prophesied, and he tells us the matter of his prophecy. "Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousand of His saints to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against Him" (Jude 5 : 14, 15). Similarly we are told of Noah in Gen. 6 : 8, 9, that he was "a just man, and perfect in his generations," and "Noah walked with God." St. Peter in his second epistle tells us that he was a "preacher of righteousness" (2 Pet. 2 : 5). Briefly stated, the conclusion to be drawn is this; that both Enoch and Noah were endowed with the gift of prophecy, and that they were prophets, in the comprehensive sense of the term prophet, *i. e.*, a Divine messenger; and as such term includes deliverance of a Divine prediction. Although these are the only instances recorded in Holy Scripture, at that period of the Church's history, it may not properly be concluded that they are the only instances actually so existent of the exercise of Prophetic gifts; but rather, and more certainly, that

such gifts were, also, possessed and exercised by others, in like manner. They are to be regarded as instances, merely. Subsequent to the flood, and immediately following the dispersion of Babel, with the call of Abraham, we enter upon a period of the Church's history in which this evidence is amplified. Abraham, and the Patriarchs, as heirs of God's special promises, were endowed with the spirit of prophecy.

It is expressly recorded of Abraham that upon God speaking to Abimelech, King of Gerar, concerning him, He said, "Now therefore restore the man his wife, for he is a Prophet, and shall pray for thee" (Gen. 20: 7). These words not only plainly declare Abraham to be a Prophet, and endowed with prophetic gifts, but they also disclose to us the fact that Abiemlech himself, and his cotemporaries were familiar with all that is meant by "a prophet"; also that Abimelech and his servants had a knowledge of Jehovah as the living and true God. Also, in the book of Job, we have incidental testimony to the same effect, when Elihu speaks of "a messenger, an interpreter, one of a thousand" (Job 33: 23.)

From all this, I say, we may certainly conclude that the fact itself, and its Divine origin and character was not only known to the patriarchs and the worshippers of Jehovah in very early times, but that it was not unknown to the nations among whom they dwelt.

God's revelation of Himself to Abimelech, and the words of warning just quoted, incidentally disclose to us much intelligence in regard to the presence of supra-natural theistic evidence at the period of time we are now considering, and under the theistic economy of natural law. A careful consideration of the books of the Old Testament will make it quite evident that the presence and agency of the Holy Spirit was by no means an unfamiliar fact to the Church of that day; and, probably, also to those outside of it; so, also (without reference now to other supra-natural manifestations), it was well understood that the Prophet was bearer of a message from God, and that he spake under inspiration from Him and acted under Divine influences.

It is a well-known fact that the Jews of our Lord's time had the greatest reverence for the prophetic office. This was not confined to the chief priests and rulers; it was a deep rooted feeling among the people generally. So much so, that when the rulers contemplated the two horns of the dilemma which the question of our Lord gave them to choose from concerning John the Baptist, and his mission, they concluded, "If we say 'of men,' all the people will stone us, for they be persuaded of John that he was a prophet indeed." Hence they conclude to say, "We cannot tell." The same difficulty confronted them when they sought to lay hands on our Blessed Lord, Himself; "They feared the multitude because they took Him for a

Prophet." So also, being questioned by the rulers as to what he thought of Jesus, the man born blind said "He is a Prophet." The words, too, of the woman of Samaria disclose the same fact of the high estimation held, alike by the Jews and the Samaritans, concerning the Prophet which Moses, before he died, prophesied of, that the Lord should raise up after him.

The question, or one of them, put by the messengers sent by John the Baptist to our Lord, was "Art Thou that Prophet?"

All these utterances cast a light backward upon the times anterior to Moses; and the words of Jehovah to Abimelech give us reason to conclude with confidence, that even then, the fact was known, and the character recognized, of chosen individuals from amongst themselves, who were wrought upon by a Power from on high to convey to their fellows a Divine message and communication, is a fact beyond reasonable doubt.

So, again, the phraseology used by Ehud, when he went in to Eglon, King of Moab (Judges 3: 19, 20) and said, "I have a secret errand to thee, O, King ——" "And Ehud said, I have a message from God unto thee. And he arose out of his seat." He did so in token of *reverence.* In view of all these facts, I regard it as a point established, that *from a very early period;* and certainly from the time of Noah, and subsequent to the time of the flood, the element of prophecy, and the office of the

prophet, as a man called of God, and charged with a message from Him, was a fact in evidence, and acknowledged as such by Noah's descendents: specially we may say by the Shemites; but also by their cotemporaries.

By purely incidental circumstances, permeating Bible history, we glean valuable information concerning the character and relation of Prophecy to Biblical Theism. Some of these circumstances I will now notice. It is a truth that has a general application to God's regenerate people, and true worshippers, that "His secret is with the righteous"; that He manifests Himself to them as He does not do to the world of unbelievers. But this general and fundamental truth has a special application to God's chosen, and official witnesses; and the prophets of the Old Testament were such in an eminent degree. We find constant evidences in Bible history of a special, and we may say, a confidential intercourse between Jehovah and His prophets. In the account given of the visit of the angels to Abraham, before the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, it is recorded that, "The Lord said, shall I hide from Abraham that thing I do, seeing that Abraham shall surely become a great and mighty nation, and all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him?" (Gen. 18: 17, 18). Abraham had already been declared of God to be a Prophet, and I think that the foregoing must be referred to that fact. Again, we find

that when Saul was seeking the lost asses (1 Sam. 9: 15, 16) it is said, "Now the Lord had told Samuel, in his ear, a day before Saul came, saying, To-morrow about this time I will send thee a man out of the land of Benjamin, and thou shalt anoint him to be captain over My people Israel." Also, the words of "the sons of the prophets" both at Bethel (to Elisha), and at Jericho, in regard to Elijah's translation, "Knowest thou that the Lord will take away thy master from thy head to-day?" are evidences of the same truth, of the special intimacy which the grace and condescension of God, accorded to His prophets with Himself. The prophet Elisha said to his servant Gehazi, in regard to the Shunamite woman who came to him in her distress, "Let her alone, for her soul is vexed within her, and the Lord hath hid it from me, and hath not told me" (2 Kings 4: 27). Several other instances might be mentioned in connection with Elisha's history. The prophet Amos, too, incidentally gives us knowledge of the same fact of this special relationship of which I have spoken. "Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but He revealeth His secret to His servants, the prophets" (Amos 3: 7, 8). Amos here speaks of it as an axiomatic truth, and it is certainly a truth that pervades sacred history.

When God so punished Dathan and Abiram for their rebellion, as recorded (Numbers 16: 28–30), we can but infer that He had given to Moses a

secret and spiritual cognizance of the nature and method of His so doing. We gather from the words of Moses, that he knew that it would be by an earthquake. Also, it is to be inferred that it was by a Divinely given knowledge that Samuel told Saul of what should occur to him after he left him; and these things, so taking place, were to be regarded as God-given signs both of God's presence with Saul, as they were to be regarded as the seals to him of Samuel's prophetic office (1 Sam. 10: 1–10).

I wish to emphasize the truth of the acknowledgment of an extraneous, supernatural and Divine influence, as so operative and giving evidence for God. The prophet Amos refers to this, and appeals to the moral sense of the Jews, when he says by the Holy Ghost, "I raised up of your sons for prophets, and Nazarenes, but ye said to the prophets, Prophesy not, and ye gave the Nazarenes wine to drink" (Amos 2: 11, 12). In the time of Samuel, and under his direction, the prophetic office was, we may consider, consolidated as an order, and so established; as the priestly office had already been so established by Moses. We may infer it to be probable that the schools of the prophets there spoken of (2 Kings 2: 1–6) had special reference to the *teaching* element in the prophetic office, and to a systematized course of instruction. The incidental mention made in 2 Kings 2: 3–8, at the time of Elijah's translation of the

"Sons of the prophets," is to be regarded in this connection as corroborating the fact immediately noticed in regard to the consolidation of the element of prophecy as related to Theism; and also of our previous inferences of its presence and progressive influence as a witness for God. The instances that I have cited, cover the whole ground from the time of Enoch to Moses and the Exodus; the period I assume to have been characterized by government under natural, as distinguished from supernatural law.

The subject of written, or inspired prophecy, does not come within the scope of our present inquiry, but will be taken up hereafter. Of the prophets charged with an oral message, subsequent to the Exodus, I will say that the record given to us of such in Holy Scripture may serve to shed further light on the period anterior; and that their history evidences a development of this element of Theism.

In regard to the title of the office itself, Elisha is called both a "prophet" and a "man of God"; so of Samuel, he is called both a "man of God," a "prophet" and a "seer." I have before considered that the office of the prophet was latent, or in embryo in the Church, and we may consider that the same is vocalized in the title, "man of God," as it expresses the fact that living piety was at least a prerequisite, if not a qualification for the office. It is the assertion of a Divine principle that a man of God, or a godly man, had the fundamental re-

quirement in this God-given characteristic, for a further bestowment of spiritual gifts; but it does not follow that such were possessed by each and every of such individual members of the living Church. Believers are, themselves, individually elected from the unbelieving, or ungodly; and the prophet or official messenger is elect out of the elect, as Bishop Jeremy Taylor says. Here, as elsewhere, we may see that all Theistic truth gravitates to the Divine personality; and, in the bestowal of spiritual gifts, "He divideth to all men, severally, as He will."

So also, do we learn from the Old Testament that the prophet had an individual calling. This would appear to have been a well-known truth. Of Samuel it is said that "all Israel, from Dan even to Beersheba, knew that Samuel was established to be a prophet of the Lord; for the Lord revealed Himself to Samuel in Shiloh, by the Word of the Lord" (1 Sam. 3: 20, 21). The same may be said of the calling of Moses, and of Elijah and Elisha. A further evidence of the sovereignty of God, and of the principle I have before noticed that all truth centres in His personality, is the fact that He has chosen *women* to this sacred office, as we read of Deborah the Prophetess, the wife of Lapidoth, and also of Hulda the Prophetess, in the time of Jeremiah.

I will again remark that the elements declarative of God as Creator, Provider and Moral Governor,

are cardinal and primary elements of Theism, and may be said to comprise all other; and as elements of His moral government, each successive element as mediately or immediately revealing Him, is built upon, incorporated and unified with them, as parts of one organic whole, ratifying, confirming and amplifying the initial elements. As they all gravitate to the centre of God's personality, all evidences are unified and consolidated in the inspired word; and God's revelation of His personality culminates in the revelation of His Incarnate Son. "The only begotten Son, who is in the bosom the Father, He hath declared Him" (John 1: 18). But, individually, we know God, or His Son Jesus Christ, only by faith, and we know Him so far as we believe upon and put our whole trust in Him.

Our Lord has coupled the knowledge of the Father, with the knowledge of Himself.—These truths are best seen in the light of *experimental religion.*—It is undoubtedly true that it is a controlling desire of the Christian to abide in Christ, to know more of Him, to love Him more, to be more conformed to His holy example. It is equally true that the hymn we know so well, expresses a desire no less necessary to the Christian heart, when it says, "Nearer my God, to Thee, nearer to Thee"!

This is the absorbing topic of the Book of Psalms, and the dominant desire therein expressed; and

this desire, at the present day, expresses most truly and most perfectly the hopes and fears, the joys and sorrows, desires and affections of godly people; *now*, I say, as well as in the ages in which they were first written and recorded.

Finally, with reference to the terminative object of prophetic gifts, and the prophetic office under the Old Testament, and especially under natural law. I think we may regard it as the assertion of the transcendence of God, as Moral Governor, as He stands related (1) to the just, and (2) to the unjust. From the standpoint of the written and recorded prophecies of the Old Testament, as well as from what is recorded of the oral ministry of Enoch and of Noah, if regarded solely with reference to the Old Testament, we might infer that the office had primary, if not exclusive reference to the sinful and unbelieving, and to the admonition of such by a declaration of God's personality, character and supervision of the affairs of men; but, we may, also, consider that such a ministry would, inherently and necessarily, have an immediate, if not prior reference to the spiritual wants and desires of His loyal and true servants, as they are special subjects of His paternal care as "seekers of the Lord," and "followers after righteousness"; and also in view of the fact that, under the New Testament economy, it is expressly stated by the apostle that spiritual gifts, generally, including the gift of prophecy, are especially and immediately Divine gifts of God to

His Church, and for its spiritual edification; also that all offices and officers of the Church are, in like manner, given and ordained for the same end (Eph. 4: 11, 12, 13).

CHAPTER VIII

DREAMS, VISIONS AND REVELATIONS

THE subject of dreams, visions and revelations comes next in order of consideration. I have collated the subject of prophecy, with that of the church, by reason of a logical relation thereto. Our present subject is rather related to that of God as Creator, and to His general oversight and superintendence. As before remarked of supernatural communications, in general, they are immediate, or direct revelations of the character, as of the will of God, as the great Supreme.

It is not irrelevant, here, to refer to that blissful period when our first parents were familiar with "the voice of the Lord God," in the garden of pleasure and delight, in the pristine days of innocence, when the tabernacle of God may be said to have been with them. At that time there was indeed a change of relationship, but God did not entirely withdraw Himself. He still held fellowship open to those who would draw nigh unto Him. Provisionally, He continued to be our Father in Heaven. The covenant of grace was an eternal decree. His voice to Adam, after transgression, "Adam, where art thou?" declared that,

although a sinner, he was neither unknown, unloved nor forsaken. Even the solemn words addressed to Cain, after his awful fratricide, are most touching and sublime. They convey to the godly man of this day a tangible and perfect assurance of their character and origin. That they are supernatural words, his whole nature instinctively and intuitively recognizes. The whole scene depicted is a word painting of facts which his own personal knowledge of God recognizes as such. It is such a knowledge as can only be, but most certainly is, supernaturally given to man, and given to him now.

The communications made of God to man, in early days, are variously characterized. They are summarized in the first verse of the first chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past to the fathers by the prophets"; but this does not fully describe them. Not all such communications were to the fathers. They were not confined to good men, nor to the patriarchs. So, also, they were various in character. The dreams and visions of which we have instances (at least in some cases) were not of that gracious character, as manifestations, with that which God gave of Himself to Moses. The twelfth chapter of the book of Numbers is an eloquent evidence of this fact. I will but quote the fifth and two following verses. "Hear now My words; if there be a prophet

among you, I, the Lord, will make Myself known to him in a vision, and speak to him in a dream; My servant Moses is not so, who is faithful in all My house. With him I will speak month to month, even apparently, and not in dark speeches, and the similitude of the Lord shall he behold; wherefore then were ye not afraid to speak against My servant Moses?"

We are forbidden to believe that the expression "mouth to mouth" can have a literal signification or, that "the similitude of the Lord" can be similarly interpreted; nor when we are told that God spake to Moses "face to face, as when a man talketh with his friend," that this can be other than an accommodated expression. It is not, really, anthropomorphic, but figurative language. We learn, then, that it was of a more gracious, free and confidential character. That there was such a spiritual and ineffable sense of the Divine presence and favor, that we can understand of in no other way. So of St. Paul's vision, when he was "caught up into Paradise, and heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter." Such distinctly and peculiarly supernatural disclosures can only be entertained by men who are supernaturally and divinely taught by God's Holy Spirit. They are similar in kind, though not in degree, to what God has now given them to realize. For this reason, no doubt, Peter and John and James, who were witnesses of our Lord's transfiguration, were

charged to "tell the vision to no man until after the Son of Man were risen from the dead." The distinction that I have noticed is an important one, and to our purpose in this connection. The inference, evidently, is this; it was part of a Divine plan and purpose, in regard to such revelations, that they should serve as corroborative evidences to men,—generally,—of those other evidences of God's government, character and personality declared by His works in nature, and in the course of His providence and care, as Creator,—over all His creatures, and especially over man, as a rational being, and as the subject of His moral government. The evidences of God, in nature, "have gone forth into all lands, and His words to the end of the world"; so also, of these immediate and supernatural messages, they were to declare that His moral government extended over them, not only to whom they were immediately given, but to mankind at large; that, although all have not the same measure of privileges in knowledge of His truth, nor shared equally in His favor, or had the same measure of accountability, yet that He was "nigh to all who call upon him, to all who call upon Him in truth."

In this connection I will refer, first, to the remarkable passage in Gen. 20: 3, 7 in relation to Abimelech, King of Gerar. "God spake unto him in a dream by night." We clearly see that not only did God so declare Himself, but that Abimelech knew and held communion with God

who spake unto him. That he was a true worshipper of Him, though not of the chosen seed, and that God so regarded him, is also evident.[1] Incidentally we gather that God gave similar evidence and manifestation of Himself to others, but Abimelech was one of those who sought the Lord and was found of Him. The case of Laban the Syrian is patent evidence of the fact that the Lord Jehovah was knowable, at that time, to the true seeker. Laban recognizes the voice and character of God. He came to Laban as to Abimelech, "in a dream, at night." The dreams of Pharaoh, of the chief butler, and the chief baker, of Joseph, and of Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar, were communications to persons widely different, both in character and position, but they, alike, disclose corroborative testimony to a supernatural and personal First-Cause, and to the fact of His universal government and superintendence, in the affairs of men. With reference to his communications to Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar, the lessons accompanying them serve very distinctly to enunciate the general principle that the Lord Jehovah was knowable and near to those sovereigns, and to Gentile nations, as well as to individual men; that, "if they would seek the Lord, if haply they might (not only) feel after Him (but) find Him, as "He is not far from every one of us," as "He gives us life and breath and all things." We gather from Holy Writ that from a very early period, God has used dreams;

"the visions of man's head upon his bed," as an avenue of Divine communication, and the same element is maintained in New Testament history. Joseph, the husband of Mary, the mother of our Lord, was instructed in a dream to flee into Egypt with the infant Saviour, and, by the same means, was directed to return from thence. "Dreams" and "Visions" are sometimes used as convertible terms, in Scripture phraseology, and the ground of this I will notice hereafter. Thus, we are told (Acts 18: 9) "Then spake the Lord to Paul, in the night, by a vision."

It is worthy of remark that these two forms of Divine communication, like other elements of Theism, have been incorporated in Holy Scripture as continuous elements of Theistic evidences, and as manifestations of His presence, and personal government of men, and of human affairs. It is also important to notice the pervasive and permeative character of God's presence and intercourse with men in this connection; and, in so doing, several subordinate distinctions are to be kept in view. 1. It is necessary to separate between a dream, as it is, in itself considered, simply the activity of the soul during sleep, or, a certain psychical operation of the mind which is the outcome of personal associations, and of physical, or even of moral law therein operating; and, as it may be accompanied by, or embodied with, an immediate act, of the Most High, whereby a Divine communication may

be made to the soul, under such conditions, *i. e.*, during sleep. It is, therefore, evident that the natural action of the soul, during sleep, and the natural causes and operations of dreams, are clearly separable from the extraneous operation of God, as Creator, upon the soul, and from the communications resulting from that act and operation. Moreover, such action is direct, and corroborative evidence of His acts and operations as Creator and Provider.

2. We have to consider the expressed purpose of God in such acts and operation. (*a*) It is to admonish man, to instruct, or to chasten him. So does Elihu declare (Job 33 : 14–18). So God admonished Laban, the Syrian, "See thou speak not to Jacob either good, or bad" (Gen. 30 : 24). So, also He warned Abimelech, King of Gerar (Gen. 20 : 3), "Behold thou art but a dead man for the woman that thou hast taken, for she is a man's wife." (*b*) Such communications were, also, expressive of peculiar favor to the individual (Numbers 12 : 6), "Hear now, my words; If there be a prophet among you, I, the Lord, will make myself known unto him in a vision, or speak unto him in a dream." It is also to be noticed under what circumstances of peculiar solemnity this fact was declared to Aaron and Miriam, as given in verse six, *i. e.*, The Shekinah as declaring the Divine presence, and the voice of God.

3. It is also to be considered that, as such a

communication was an immediate and personal revelation of God, and, so, an evidence peculiar to Theism, corroborating the fact of the Divine existence, and the claims of God, as Creator and Governor, as also declarative of His will; it was a distinct assertion of His sovereignty, and of His absolute freedom as moral governor.

4. Further, in some cases they were designed to declare an element of the Divine character, and being, dogmatically taught and historically recorded as an essential element of Theism, viz., the Divine inscrutability.

(With reference to this subject, it is only necessary, here, to say that, as a Biblical truth, and as an element of Theism maintained through all progressive development of God's counsel and will, such inscrutability is relative, and not absolute, as declared by agnostics.)

The meaning of some dreams could only be understood by men who were specially taught of God, as well as specially approved of Him. So Joseph declared, "Do not interpretations belong unto God? Tell me them, I pray you" (Gen. 40 : 8). (Joseph was herein appealing, not only to the knowledge, but to the religious consciousness of those he addressed, hence we have, herein, a just and an important inference afforded us.) Let us notice that this element, now before us, is incorporated with the dispensation of the Spirit, and the promise thereof, in the last days, *i. e.*, "I will pour out of

My Spirit upon all flesh. Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy; your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dréams" (Joel 2: 28). Daniel also declared to Nebuchadnezzar that he himself, had no personal ability to declare the king's secret; so also Joseph declared to Pharaoh, "It is not in me, God shall give Pharaoh an answer of peace" (Gen. 41: 16). We are told in Daniel 1: 17 that it was on account of their piety, and allegiance to Jehovah, that understanding was given to Daniel and his companions at the court of the king; "And Daniel had understanding in all visions and dreams." The importance of these facts, as substantiated and sealed by Holy Writ, will be more evident, as developed in the course of our enquiry herein. There is one more fact to be noticed in regard to dreams. It is concerning the superstitious use made of them. This superstitious dependence upon dreams, does not stand connected with God's personality, as declared in Holy Scripture, nor with faith in other elements of Theism by which God declares Himself. This superstitious regard to dreams is rebuked of God, by the prophet Jeremiah, when he says (Jer. 23: 25–32) of false prophets that, "They think to cause My people to forget My name, by their dreams which they tell every man to his neighbor, as their fathers have forgotten my name for Baal." Also, "Behold I am against them that prophesy false dreams, and I have heard what the prophets said that prophesy

lies in my name, saying, I have dreamed, I have dreamed" (Jer. 23: 25, 26). For this reason, he says "they are prophets after the deceit of their own heart," and, "the prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream; but he that hath My Word, let him speak My word faithfully. What is the chaff to the wheat, saith the Lord" (Jer. 23: 28).

The lesson we are here to learn from this is that God's Word is the final touchstone of truth, by which all evidences are ultimately to be tried; moreover, that it has marvelous power and efficacy. "Is not My word like a fire, saith the Lord? and as the hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces?" Not only has it such marvelous and supernatural power, but it embodies, as it consolidates all evidences. As connected with such consolidation, I may here refer to the dream of Pilate's wife. "Have thou nothing to do with that just man, for I have suffered many things this day, in a dream because of Him" (Matt. 27: 19). This statement carries with it evidences of a Divine purpose, and of a Divine communication.

Another class of Divine communications is distinctively termed "revelations." And here we may notice a further subdivision. Such revelations as I here refer to, are to be distinguished from prophetic revelations, and, especially from such as were to be committed to writing for transmission to posterity as a written and inspired record; they were of a

more social and individual character. We have not so full an account of God's revelations to Noah, as of His subsequent revelations to the patriarchs, but, from the somewhat different circumstances of each, we are probably correct in supposing them to have been of the same character as those given to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. At different epochs of their history, we read that "The Lord spake unto them," or that He "appeared unto them." "The Word of the Lord" seems to have been an equivalent expression for such revelations, or manifestations. We are not told at what time, whether by day or by night, or in what manner the Lord spake; we are simply told of the fact; but, such communications were continuously and graciously given to them of God. As Jacob spake of "The Lord who had fed him all his life long," and of "the Angel that delivered him out of all his tribulation" (Gen. 48: 15, 16). As they walked before God by faith and prayer, so God gave them tangible proofs of His presence. The Shekinah was to the journeying Israelites, as a people, what such revelations were to the individual saints and servants of God. God's revelation of Himself to Gideon and to the Judges was of a similar character. I have referred to God's communications with Moses, as marking peculiar, personal and official privileges, and to the fact that "the Word of the Lord" appears to be an expression tantamount to the revelations we are now considering. A further distinction to that before noted is

to be traced in some of the communications made to the patriarchs, and identical in character to that peculiar, personal and condescending intercourse with God, enjoyed by Moses. One I will now notice is found in the case of Abraham, in Gen. 17: 1-3, where it is said, in contradistinction from what we read in Gen. 15; (*i. e.*, The Word of the Lord came unto Abraham) that "the Lord appeared unto Abraham." Moreover it is said in verse twenty-two "he fell on his face, and God talked with him." So in like manner in Gen. 35: 9, "God appeared to Jacob, again, when he came from Padam-Aram, and blessed him." He had appeared to him, before, when he fled there, and we are told (Gen. 35: 15) that Jacob called the name of the place where God talked with him, Bethel; and in verse thirteen, "God went up from him in the place where He talked with him." It is, here, very pertinent to notice that in the thirty-fifth chapter of Genesis, verse one, Jehovah Himself refers to that time when He appeared to him, when He said, "Arise, go up to Bethel and dwell there, and make thee an altar unto God, who appeared unto thee when thou fleddest from the face of Esau thy brother."

It was divinely declared to Aaron and Miriam that Moses should be peculiarly privileged; and it is also said that "God talked with Moses as a man talketh with his friend," and we read in Ex. 33: 9, that as Moses entered the tabernacle "the cloudy

pillar descended and stood at the door of the tabernacle, and the Lord talked with Moses." Expression is elsewhere given to the same fact that on many occasions the Most High gave him similar distinguished marks of His peculiar favor and confidence; and such manifestations of His peculiar presence and nearness as it was possible for him to enjoy. Abraham's favor, as the "Friend of God" was scarcely less than that of Moses. This leads me to refer to some angelic appearances of a special character, or of Jehovah as the Angel of the Covenant. I refer particularly to the occasion when Abraham pleaded with God for Sodom. The whole narrative is expressive of sublime condescension and grace in God's attitude towards Him, and presents the patriarch's character and privileged position with singular majesty and felicitude, as he pleaded with God for the guilty city. As has been remarked, "God only ceased to give when Abraham ceased to pray." The scene closes with the statement, "And the Lord went His way after He had left communing with Abraham, and Abraham returned to his place" (Gen. 18: 33).

Angelic Messages and Messengers.

Of angelic messages and messengers, it is to be noticed that they form an element of Theism of a distinctive character. Like that of other elements spoken of, they are continuous under, and they con-

nect and unify the Old and the New Testament dispensations.

Some instances may be mentioned. They are given as instances, only. The Israelites, as a people, recognized the ministry of the angels as a ministry peculiar to the worship of Jehovah, and as a Theistic evidence. Stephen, the first Christian martyr, charged against the rulers of the Jews that they had "received the law through the disposition of angels and had not kept it" (Acts 7 : 52, 53). In similar terms it is spoken of in the first chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews. As individual instances the Angel that appeared to Moses, to Manoah, and to Daniel; to Abraham, to Jacob, to Elijah and to Joshua, are instances under the Old Testament. Under the New Testament, the angel who loosed Peter's chains, who appeared to Paul, and the angel who was sent to Elizabeth and to the Virgin Mary; also the angel who appeared, several times, to Joseph, her husband. The angel with whom Abraham pleaded for Sodom was, without doubt, the angel Jehovah, and appears to have been so recognized by Abraham himself. It is perhaps generally accepted as a fact, that the same is true of the angel who appeared to Joshua, but it is by no means certainly true.

We read that the angel who spake to Elizabeth and to Mary was an angel of very high order, whose name was Gabriel, and who (as he said)

stood "in the presence of God."[1] The inference we may draw from all the evidence, under the Old and under the New Testaments, is that the ministry of angels in the affairs of men both has been and is of a constant and very pervasive character. We are distinctly told that "they are all ministering spirits sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation" (Heb. 1). Also, that they are constant guardians over, as well as ministers to the servants of God. These facts have a most important bearing upon the subject now before us. There are, yet, two Divine manifestations to be considered and included in this particular class of theistic evidence. They are unique in character and they convey to us special lessons. I refer to the revelations of God, at Mt. Sinai and Mt. Horeb, to Moses and the assembled multitude, and to Elijah personally and individually. I shall simply notice the salient features of each. The personal manifestations vouchsafed of God to individuals have been of a privileged and confidential character, as unto those whose course of life He has approved of, or as unto those whom He has chosen to

[1] "The Angel of the Lord" (Ex. 33 : 14). Comparing a number of passages, to the same effect, and having in view the fact that there are angels spoken of, in Holy Scripture, of various orders, and degrees, Dr. Pusey, in his commentary, or defense of the book of Daniel against rationalists, (pp. 520–21) regards it as at least doubtful, in most cases, as to the actual, visible presence of one of the Divine persons of the Holy Trinity.

fulfil His pleasure, and to be the bearers of His messages. The majority of the disclosures given to us in Holy Writ are of this character. Those now to be noticed, but especially the manifestation to the assembled nation at Mt. Sinai were of a different character. We may notice in all the manifestations given to Israel, as a people, that they were progressive in character. They were educational and disciplinary. So in fact God, Himself, has described them. He says, "I bare you on eagle's wings to lead you to Myself." Moses, in his song, similarly describes God's dealings with them. The miracles of Egypt, the Red Sea and the wilderness were so characterized. The judgments upon Egypt and upon Pharaoh were, to them, lessons upon God's character, and declarations of His personality. All this, it would appear, culminated at the time and upon the occasion when God gave to them His written law. It is probable that when the decalogue was framed and solemnly delivered, the whole of the books of Moses was at least in process of formation; this is clearly true of the ceremonial law; it is probably true that the historical records of Genesis were formulated at that time, and embodied therewith. The miraculous acts and interventions were distinct disclosures of His glorious personality, and manifestations of His character by His attributes; not one of them only, for, although one, or more, may be more in evidence, one cannot be separated from the other; but at the peculiarly

solemn time and occasion when the Israelites were organized of God, as a nation and a peculiar people, the display of God's character and glory at that time was to be coupled with a solemn, explicit and recorded expression of His most sacred Will. Not of His Will, alone, but of His most holy and righteous Will. It was the declaration of that Will, not only as connected with the concurrent, or simultaneous manifestation of His Almighty power and holiness upon that occasion; but, as connected with all their past experience of His truth, His power and His love. All these facts are made use of by Moses, at various times, as mementoes, and as a stimulus to duty. They are recalled and recapitulated, at length in the book of Deuteronomy, and epitomized in that song that Moses was directed of God to teach them. If Mt. Sinai and the giving of the law can be connected with one specific purpose of God,—only, then we must say that it was a purpose to impress them most solemnly with the fact that Jehovah is a holy God, "Glorious in holiness, fearful in praises, doing wonders." His words to Moses when He made all His glory to pass before him are the most perfect declaration of the harmony of His attributes, and that in Him, as in His Incarnate Son, "Mercy and truth have met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other."

I have now a few words to say upon the manifestation at Horeb. This manifestation, although

given to the prophet Elijah personally, may be said to have a general lesson for the church, collectively. Like that at Mt. Sinai, it is a distinct disclosure of God's glorious personality. The prophet was divinely and miraculously led there to behold it, and that the lesson might be conveyed to us. The occasion serves to further harmonize and unify the two manifestations of God. If God's voice, on Sinai, was "as the voice of thunder, exceeding loud, the voice at Horeb was that of a "still small voice." It followed the wind, the earthquake, and the fire (1 Kings 19: 11, 12). It was the same God who spake at Sinai and at Horeb. It tells us that, although God's " way is in the sea, and His path in the great waters, and His footsteps are not known," —yet—" He led His people like sheep, by the hand of Moses and Aaron " ; and so, as David says, by " pondering these things, we shall understand the loving kindness of the Lord " (Ps. 107: 43).

As evidence of the fact that the elements of theism are cumulative and culminatory, as contrasted with the theory of evolution, it is in point to mention some instances of visions, and revelations recorded in the New Testament.

First, of the vision vouchsafed to St. Paul. His extraordinary conversion to the Christian faith was associated with a vision of our Lord Jesus Christ, who spake to him and called him, both to His discipleship, and to the office of an apostle and official witness for Him (Acts 9: 3–7). After his conver-

sion, he himself tells us of certain "visions and revelations of the Lord" in which he was "caught up into Paradise." More than one instance of God speaking to him, subsequently, "in a vision" is recorded in the record of his apostolic journeyings in the book of the Acts of the Apostles. When God sent Peter to Cornelius, He spake unto Cornelius by a vision (Acts 10: 1–8); and to prepare Peter to go to Cornelius and for the messengers sent by him, God spake to Peter by a vision (Acts 10: 9–17). When the Lord sent Ananias to Saul, He spake to him by a vision (Acts 9: 10–16). It is specially worthy of notice, and is strong evidence of the cumulative character of theistic evidences, and of this one in particular, that it is given to us on the solemn occasion of the Transfiguration of our Blessed Lord, on the holy mount, where Elijah and Moses "talked with Him of His decease which He should accomplish at Jerusalem." Our Lord speaks of it as a vision. "Tell the vision to no man until the Son of Man is risen from the dead" (Matt. 17: 9). For sufficient reasons it was given, and, we may infer for the purpose of evidencing in a special manner His Divine personality; and these disciples were the chosen and honored witnesses of it, who, as the most zealous, were nearest to Him. Also, the final revelation given to the church, and that by our Lord Jesus Christ, as its risen Head, was given to the beloved disciple St. John, by a vision. These instances are

fully sufficient in corroboration of the evidence already given, and go to shew that the elements of theism, severally and collectively, are not transient in character, but permanent and abiding; and as each of those elements are continuous and parts of a whole, so of the doctrines given to us in Holy Scripture from the beginning; they are a progressive and a culminatory revelation of God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Ghost.

In regard to the particular subject we are now considering, I would remark that, in common with other elements of Theism, it is of a corroborative character, as related to the primary, and what we may consider fundamental elements of Natural Theology and Natural Religion. These, in themselves considered, from their necessary and intrinsic character, are, severally, witnesses for God as Creator and Moral Governor; and to these two great foundation truths, all other theistic evidences may be said to be tributary. By a moral and a necessary sequence they proceed therefrom, as from an efficient cause, and, as they do so, they give testimony by their homogeneity, of their source and original. Severally and collectively, they bear witness for God, as Creator and Moral Governor. The primary elements are fortified and consolidated by the supernatural disclosures, mediate and immediate, of God's personality, as the Supreme Good, and as the Supreme Governor of men.

Moreover, these various theistic evidences have not been confined exclusively to one part of the human family; although afterwards, one individual, and one family was chosen of God for the purpose, not only of conserving such evidences, but, also, of consolidating them; as well as for that of developing and perfecting them by cumulative testimony of His Inspired Word, and by His Incarnate Son. Of the Abrahamic covenant, and patriarchal age, I shall speak more fully in connection with the Mosaic economy. It will be sufficient, now, to recapitulate the corroborative and supernatural evidence before referred to.

(1) The church of God, as an elect company of believing men, subjects of moral elimination and of the electing love of God, and fitting and necessary witnesses for theism, as an objective fact. (2) Collated therewith and morally related thereto, are the unwritten and vocal traditions consequent from the church, as a company of believing men, and necessarily making confession of their faith; and (3) in immediate connection with the fact and being of the church, the constitution of prophecy, and the prophetic office, as related to the church, and to mankind; and (4) those immediate and direct supernatural communications which the all-glorious God has vouchsafed, in various ways, to make of Himself, in various degrees of favor and of privilege, to individuals, in various relations, personal and official; and also by them to particular persons or nations.

Before leaving this topic, I will now direct attention to the sophistical and misleading character of the teaching of "Lux Mundi," as related to Theistic evidences, generally. The whole volume ignores the objective evidences for God in nature, and also the supernatural evidences herein spoken of. In addition to this, the general evidence of the Old Testament Scriptures is belittled and special capital made of the Incarnation in favor of the hypothesis of evolution. The term "religion" is used in an abstract signification, and from the standpoint of heathen corruptions of theistic truth, and from that of their superstitions. Moreover, the polytheism and various religious systems of the world generally are regarded as homogeneous in character with theism and the Old Testament scriptures and Mosaic Law, as constituted and ordained by Jehovah.

In general, the idea is conveyed that there was little clear knowledge of God under the Old Testament dispensation, and as represented, either by the Ante, or post-diluvial periods, or by the Mosaic economy; and no certain or definite knowledge of Him in the early history of the world; indeed by implication, as well as by direct statement, the early Bible history is regarded as mythical, and not historical in character, and it is held, in the same way, that Monotheism was "evolved" from Polytheism. Upon this assumption, and upon these premises,—assumed to be true,—and that the knowl-

edge of the living and true God was productive of a religion similar in kind to that of heathendom, we are told that it is necessary for morality to correct and to purify religion, in general; including Theistic and Biblical religion as represented by the Old Testament scriptures particularly; and that it is by scientific and philosophical knowledge, or by what claims to be such, *i. e.*, by evolution as a universal force, that such purification is to be effected; effected moreover by evolution as a Divine Law and appointment. Thus evolution is grafted upon Christianity, for we are told that under the New Testament, by the incarnation of our Blessed Lord, as an especial evolution of Theism, subjectively considered a revised and a more correct idea is given to us of the nature of God than that given in the Old Testament; rather,—it is a revelation by contrast.

As I have before said, the objective evidence afforded us in nature is ignored, as is also the evidence of the Old Testament; and the argument is subjective and abstract in character; it is also metaphysical and introspective. Its broadly rationalistic character is evident from the fact that it makes morality more efficient than subjective theism, and philosophy, objectively considered, more effectual than Holy Scripture; and,—yet more positively,—by the absolute attack that is made upon supernatural religion, in that the transcendent and Divine work of the Holy Spirit upon

the mind of the authors of the several books of the sacred scriptures is classed with merely natural, although special gifts; and with the attainments of specialists in natural arts and sciences.

CHAPTER IX

MIRACLES

A MIRACLE may be defined as an extraordinary occurrence, *i. e.*, something unusual and aside from the settled order of things. The Divine acts of our Lord Jesus Christ are spoken of in Holy Scripture as "miracles and wonders and signs." The terms, each and all, may be resolved into reference and relationship to God's personality; the term "sign" having reference to an indication of the presence and action of Deity. And, as the words, severally considered, have reference to God's personality, so also do they include reference to Law, and to a Law-Giver. An extraordinary occurrence in the physical world must include the acknowledgment of an order that obtains, as a settled economy of the universe, of which order the special occurrence is aside from, though not necessarily contrary thereto. The unusual occurrence may be marvelous to us, by reason of our limited knowledge of the laws that govern the physical universe, and of their correlations to each other. We have knowledge of the fact that several of these laws have an obscure relation to each other which we are not able to analyze, and that slight modifications, of

which, from their plastic nature, they are susceptible, materially alter their operation and results. The fact, therefore, of the existence and operation of such extraordinary events hinge upon the existence of a Supreme First-Cause and Personality, and, further, upon the exercise of His good will and pleasure. The human will is the dominant and controlling faculty of man's moral nature. It is the ultimate and the directing force which governs, moulds and subordinates all his other faculties,—physical and moral. It may be put in operation by passion, or by defective knowledge, and its results will be governed and characterized accordingly.

The will of an All-Perfect Personality is a perfect will, incapable of an error by defective knowledge, or wrong motive power. God's will, while from its nature and operations it will glorify His own character, is never exercised apart from most perfect ends in regard to mankind. This truth applies to the matter before us, *i. e.*, the highest exercise of His supreme perfections and personality by miraculous acts. It will be, here, useful and sufficient to notice the fact of the important relation this truth bears to all doctrinal religion, and also its supreme consequence to the soul of the individual believer upon one living and true God, and Jesus Christ, whom He has sent.

It will thus appear from these premises that miracles may (1) be compatible with a settled

economy of physical order in the universe, and also (2) that they are highly consistent with the fact of a personal Creator of the world and of a perfect Personality; and as the expression of a perfect will.

But we may go further. Reverently reasoning from the less to the greater, and from what is the highest knowledge open to us, viz., our own personality as finite moral agents, created, as we are apprised by God Himself, in His image and likeness,—we may even say, upon this basis, that miracles, as expressing the actions of the Divine Purpose and Will,—as Supreme and representing a Perfect Being, not alone, as Creator, but as Moral Governor of men, and as, so, related to a world that has rebelled against Him; in the assertion of His personality and of His relation to them by rightful and just authority, for the maintenance of His own glory, as for the necessary good of His creatures; and from the standpoint of a perfect will; His extraordinary and immediate interposition by miracles in His oversight and government of the world would seem to be even necessary as well as desirable.

With these preparatory remarks, I proceed to consider the subject of miracles as an element of Theism, and as related to Old Testament history.

Miracles may thus be regarded as immediate manifestations of the sovereignty of God, as Creator and Governor. We may say, also, that they

are the highest exhibition of the Divine supernatural. They are peculiar to Monotheism, as final evidences of the supremacy and perfections of Jehovah.

The great miracle of the Old Testament, anterior to Inspiration, was the flood. It is noticeable that the visitation of God upon human sin, while asserting His perfections and personality, was directed particularly to sin against Him, as Creator, and so also as Benefactor (Gen. 6 : 7).

The primary proofs of the Divine existence and character are drawn from creation and providence. "He did good, and sent us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness" (Acts 14 : 15-17).

It is also to be noticed that when God had established the Jews in Canaan, He instituted and ordained a solemn feast, the Feast of the First-Fruits, in recognition of the fundamental truth of Theism, that He is the Lord of the harvest, and that He is to be solemnly acknowledged as such.

This primary claim which God has made upon men, as their Creator and Benefactor, is never abrogated, nor is it merged in, or superseded by progressive disclosures of Him, as Redeemer. His attributes, as God, and His claims as Creator and First-Cause, are nowhere more fully declared than by the evangelical prophet Isaiah, "Yea, before the day was I am He, and there is none that can deliver out of My hand; I will work and who shall let it?"

(Is. 43: 10–14). So Moses in his song says, "Do ye thus requite the Lord, O foolish people, and unwise? Is not He thy Father that hath bought thee? Hath He not made thee and established thee?" (Deut. 32: 6). Again, "Then he forsook the Lord that made him, and lightly esteemed the Rock of his Salvation. They provoked Him to jealousy with strange gods; with abominations provoked they Him to anger; they sacrificed to devils and not to God; to gods whom they knew not, to new gods that came newly up, whom your fathers feared not. Of the Rock that begat thee, thou art unmindful and has forgotten God that formed thee" (Deut. 32: 15–18). It was this sin against God, as Creator and Benefactor, that provoked the flood. The aggravation of polytheistic idolatry was the fact that God, as known,—known as to His personality and character from the earliest ages,—was forgotten and rejected. So God says, "I will destroy man, whom I have created, from the face of the earth; for it repenteth Me that I have made them" (Gen. 6: 7). From the standpoint of all facts relevant to the subject, man's sin against God was against adequate and sufficient evidence,—the evidences of His works, as Creator, and of His fatherly care over man, as Lord over creation by His ontological qualities, and by God's gift and appointment.

Noah's preaching to the antediluvians is suggestive of important and elementary considerations.

It was prophetic, as it declared a purpose of the Most High. It was, also, a direct assertion of His existence and personality as known, and of His supremacy. It is specially important, in this connection. It is one of the many facts against evolution. Noah's preaching was of righteousness. Here, too, is an appeal to the "First Law Eternal," as it refers to the Author and Giver of law to man; and to the "Second Law Eternal," as it appeals to that law of man's nature, given to him by his Creator, as the rule of his life; the law of knowledge, and the power to discriminate between right and wrong.. The flood was a reassertion of God's claims as Creator. Only He who first created the earth, by the fiat of His will, and who, afterwards, "made it" or fitted it up "to be inhabited" (Is. 45 : 18) could destroy it, or reduce it to chaos. The execution of this purpose was God's retributive judgment upon man, as transgressor against Him as Creator, and against the law of His own being, by unbelief and disobedience.

The evidence in support of the fact itself, as given in sacred history is fortified by collateral witness. In the traditions of various ancient nations are transmitted legends of the Creation, Fall of Man, the Flood and other prominent events of Bible story. Also, in our own day, geologists, generally, are agreed that a temporary elevation and subsidence of the crust of the earth, corresponding to that of the flood, of sacred history, took place about

that time, and that such was not local, but general, in extent. The flood, as a retributive visitation, was designed of God to be a monument to Himself, as Creator, and as a warning to sinners in subsequent ages of the world's history, specially to high-handed transgressors; and to such, declaration of the fact of a future, final and universal judgment (2 Pet. 2 : 5, 6, 7). We may consider that, in the flood of sacred history, the theistic evidences, or elements of the knowledge of God, were fully declared and manifested. Subsequent history did but consolidate and develop them. This judgment of God upon antediluvians, nevertheless, well known as it must have been to the descendents of Noah, did not restrain them from sin; rather, we may say, that such did but stimulate the unbelieving and ungodly to more ungodliness. Such we infer from the action of the Israelites and from our own knowledge and experience of sin, as a law. Increasing iniquity called for another judgment. The cities of the plain exceeded in wickedness their cotemporaries; although among the nations of Canaan, polytheistic abominations were working the overthrow that, subsequently, overtook them.

In these two judgments the direct and immediate hand of God was manifested; and they carry with them the fullest evidence for Him, in all the glory of His perfections, and also for all the elements of His moral government.

The terms "miracles and wonders and signs" do

not appear to be strictly synonymous, although sometimes used as convertible terms. In general, we may conclude that a miraculous act was a "sign" that God was present with the person performing it. So did Nicodemus express a generally accepted truth. "We know Thou art a Teacher come from God, for no man can do these miracles that thou doest expect God be with him" (John 3: 2). So, also the words of the man born blind were the same effect. "If this man were not of God, he could not do nothing" (John 9: 33). From these passages and others of the same import, we gather that they were generally regarded as peculiar to theism, *i. e.*, to Monotheism, and, moreover, that while, as proof, they were conclusive and indisputable, so also that they were, as such proof, indispensably necessary. Such a requirement, by the elders of Israel, appears to have been anticipated, and, so, provided for by God Himself, when He sent Moses, as His messenger (Exodus 4: 29–31). So also, in regard to Pharaoh (Exodus 7: 8, 9). So, we may notice that when Moses, as commanded by God, had performed the miracles He had appointed him to do, in presence of the elders and of the people, "the people believed, and when they heard that the Lord had visited the children of Israel, and that He had looked upon their affliction, then they bowed their heads and worshipped" (Ex. 4: 30, 31). Similarly in the course of Holy Scripture, disobedience to the

evidence given by miracles, and ingratitude for marvelous, personal and extraordinary interpositions from the hand of God is regarded as expressive of obduracy in sin, and peculiar aggravation of God's goodness. This applies to the sins of the people under the leadership of Moses and Joshua, and also to that of the Jews who rejected our Lord Jesus Christ. A due consideration of these facts suggests a twofold lesson. The evidence supplied by authenticated miracles entailed accumulated responsibility, by the mere fact of their presentation; while the facts of history and of experience go to assure us that no amount of evidence, in itself considered, could necessitate obedience from the moral agent; that, in order thereto, faith, as a moral quality, was requisite and essential; in fact that moral probation is a necessary and inseparable element of God's government of man, as it is consonant with his constitution as God's creature, and from the fact that his character and manner of life, with all its results, must, necessarily, be self-determined. That obedience is the result of a Divine faith, alone, but it is the act of a free agent, under moral and spiritual law. The miracles wrought of God, by Moses, in Egypt, form another link in the evidence from this source, and manifest a development of His character and government. The opposition of "the magicians of Egypt," as they are plainly termed in Holy Scripture, is also declared by the same author to be "by their enchantments."

Here is a concurrent manifestation of a supernatural power that is Satanic; a development, too, of a power that was present in Eden, and traceable throughout sacred history. Such a statement, and such an interpretation of language is but in harmony and consistent with subsequent teaching of Holy Scripture, and a subsequent recognition therein of the same facts, and of the same power. From a positive standpoint we learn that the judgments, or plagues of God, visited upon the Egyptians were directed against their several "gods," or idols (Ex. 12: 12) and were an assertion of His claim upon them, as their Creator; and moreover, not alone knowable of them, as such, but also actually known, and departed from and disobeyed.

We may trace a similarity between Jannes and Jambres, who opposed Moses, and the false prophet Balaam, or, as he is called, necromancer. From the way in which they are referred to by St. Paul, as well as from the facts of the history, we may draw inferential lessons. Balaam sought to bring a curse upon the Israelites; he sinned against knowledge of Jehovah. We may infer that the magicians, also, sinned against knowledge; they were finally constrained to acknowledge, "*This* is the finger of God" (Ex. 8: 19).

The final judgment upon Pharaoh, and upon Egypt, previous to the Exodus, was the slaying of the first-born; it was the culminating act both of punitive visitation, and of supernatural and direct

evidence of Jehovah's supremacy in the controversy with their idolatry; but it was yet to be followed by a sublime assertion of His power, as Creator, in their overthrow in the Red Sea. In confirmation of the Bible narrative of the Exodus and the passage of the Red Sea, we have the testimony of Rahab that it was known and acknowledged as a fact by the Canaanites (Joshua 2 : 8–12). Also the Philistines in like manner were cognizant of it, and it was, as a fact, by them unquestioned. In noticing the fact as related to the responsibility of the Egyptians, and heathen nations generally, for the knowledge of Jehovah, as Creator, it is important, also, to notice the fact that God has emphasized the same truth as related to the responsibility of Israel, as His chosen nation and peculiar people. The decalogue, itself, is so prefaced: "I am the Lord thy God who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage." It is immediately followed by the first commandment, "Thou shalt have no other gods, but Me."

The same reason is adduced in ratification of the Sabbath, as a Divine ordinance, and as a memorial of creation, and the great Creator, *i. e.*, as a reason additional to the acknowledgment and memorial of God as Creator, the further acknowledgment of Him as Deliverer. "Therefore, the Lord thy God commandeth thee to keep the Sabbath day." (Deut. 5 : 15).

In like manner, in Deut. 8 : 4, and 15, 16, Moses

connects with the Exodus, the marvelous care and preservation of the Almighty, as manifested in the wilderness journey. "Thy raiment waxed not old upon thee neither did thy foot swell, these forty years."[1] In this one fact, as connected with the manna, and the smitten rock, is summed up the miraculous confirmation of the primary and fundamental truth of a personal Creator, and the glory of His being, as Jehovah; and as that fact was so asserted to Israel, and so confirmed, is it, by them, asserted and confirmed to us.

Also,—in this one fact (*i. e.*, "thy raiment waxed not old upon thee, neither did thy foot swell these forty years") it is evidenced, as an appeal to their

[1] A similar instance of the personal care and oversight of God over them. is, as it were, incidentally referred to by the Psalmist (Ps. 105 : 37). "He brought them forth also with silver and gold; there was not one feeble person among their tribes."

They had, before the Exodus, experienced God's singular care when in inflicting plagues on the Egyptians, He exempted the land of Goshen from the visitations with which he visited other parts of the land (Ex. 9 : 4–7, 24, 25; 10 : 22, 23). In like manner He promised to the children of Israel that, upon their obedience, He would, after this manner, shew His special favor towards them (Deut. 7 : 12–16). These and many other instances that might be given go to shew that, as the supernatural, or miraculous, or, as it may be properly termed, the theistic element, pervaded all their history, and so distinguished it as sacred history, so also, by this fact, is the transcendent personality of Jehovah exalted and magnified; and, as this truth holds prominence in their history and throughout Holy Scripture, in the same ratio does it discredit it and deny the dominance which is claimed by "Lux Mundi" for the Pantheistic doctrine of immanence, in Creation.

own knowledge, and to their own consciousness, how completely the supernatural pervades and is bound up with the natural in their history, and throughout Holy Scripture as an organic whole; and that, if this particular narrative, itself, is authentic and true, then its essentially distinctive and supernatural character, as sacred history, is herein and hereby demonstrated; while, if it be not so received, in toto, it must be, in toto, rejected; and it is equally valid and true of the whole of the inspired record. A due reflection upon, and a just estimate of theistic evidences, generally, will go to shew how the God of nature is evidenced in all His works, as in all the course of the world, and in the lives of men; and it is sufficiently evident to a reasonable faith, that the supernatural, everywhere, interpenetrates and pervades the natural; but the evidences of this latter fact culminates in miraculous interventions. God, who wrought all the miracles in Egypt, Himself went before them, in the Exodus, by a supernatural sign in the heavens, discernible by all, "the pillar of a cloud by day, and the pillar of fire by night." He took it not away, at any time. At the passage of the Red Sea, a special and a marvelous transposition took place. Moses, at God's command, lifted up his rod and stretched out his hand over the sea, and as he did so, the waters divided, and the angel of the Lord, and the pillar of the cloud, which heretofore had gone before them, removed and stood behind them,

being a cloud and darkness to the Egyptians, so that they came not near to the Israelites all night; while it lighted the latter in their forward march through the bed of the sea. We are told, both in the twenty-second and twenty-ninth verses that "the waters were a wall unto them, on their right hand and on their left." When all Pharoah's host, his chariots and horsemen had followed them into the midst of the sea—not until then—the Lord took off their chariot wheels, that they drave them heavily, and they were made to realize that the Lord fought for the Israelites against the Egyptians. Then, at God's command, Moses again stretched forth his rod over the sea which returned to his strength behind the Israelites and overwhelmed the Egyptians; while it was restrained before the Israelites until they passed over. We learn from the statement of the Gibeonites that the tradition of this interposition had reached them, as we learn from that of Rahab that it had reached other of the tribes of Canaan.

In chronological order, I will next mention the miracles of the wilderness journey. The smiting of the rock by Moses, when the Israelites strove with God, at Rephidim, and they were miraculously supplied with water; the miracle of the manna, of which they ate, daily, until they reached the borders of the promised land; the miracle of the quails, at Kibroth-hattaavah; the miracle of healing those bitten by fiery serpents. There is an

instance specially noticeable, viz., the judgment of God upon Philistines in connection with the ark. The bringing of the ark into the temple of Dagon and setting it by Dagon was in effect to class Jehovah with Dagon; and it was so regarded and judged of Jehovah. Five cities, in succession, were smitten, and the Philistines consulted their "diviners." Their language and advice are significant. As in the case of the "magicians" of Egypt, there is evidence that they were not without knowledge of Jehovah, as the true and living God. Their reference, also, to the plagues of Egypt, and to Pharaoh and the Egyptians hardening their hearts, is not only corroborative of the historic fact of the Exodus, as known to them, but also gives evidence of a moral conviction of the truth and force of the claims of Jehovah, so asserted. "Wherefore do ye harden your hearts, like as Pharaoh and the Egyptians hardened their hearts? When He had wrought wondrously among them, did He not let the people go, and they departed?" (1 Sam. 6 : 6).

Among the prominent miracles of the Old Testament is the passage of Jordan, and the fall of Jericho. It is similar in character to the passage of the Red Sea. As that event stood related to the leadership of Moses, so does the passage of the Jordan to that of Joshua. The words of Jehovah in relation thereto are very significant, and they go to show that it was a purpose of the Most High so to magnify Joshua before the Israelites, and to give

them a sensible token of His presence with Joshua, as He had been with Moses. Such was the assurance to Joshua (Joshua 1 : 1–10 ; 3 : 7), "This day will I begin to magnify thee in the sight of all Israel." As it has been attempted to explain away the miraculous character of the passage of the Red Sea, so of that of the Jordan. The words of the inspired writer are however very plain, in both cases, in regard to the passage through the waters. At the Red Sea, we are told "The waters were a wall unto them on their right hand and on their left." In Joshua 3 : 16 we are told that the waters from above were arrested and "stood on an heap," and, while the distinctly miraculous intervention of Jehovah is thus marked, it is made still more significant by the fact that such intervention is directly connected with the passage of the Ark of the Covenant, and only when the priests who bare it had come up out of the waters, did the waters of Jordan return to their accustomed course (Joshua 4 : 18). The circumstances attending the fall of Jericho are similar in character, and, as both were designed to strengthen the hands of Joshua and to assure the Israelites that they were to regard him as Moses' successor, so do we find that the fame of these events, and of the power and majesty of Jehovah was, in like manner, magnified before the surrounding nations, as it was at the passage of the Red Sea.

I will again remark upon the fact that the whole

of the Old Testament history is pervaded by the marvelous, as everything relating to the Most High is so marked; and this attribute of God is so frequently referred to in Holy Scripture. There are two other miraculous acts, recorded in the prophecies of Daniel, that must be included in this summary. First, the deliverance of Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego from the burning fiery furnace, and, secondly, the deliverance of Daniel from the den of lions. They are put upon record as facts of history. I do not know that, as such, they have been disputed by those who would reject the prophecies of Daniel. They are related in Holy Scripture as facts connected with the history of Chaldea, and the lives of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar and Darius. As they are connected with the reigns of those monarchs, they are connected with profane as well as sacred history. Like the dreams of Nebuchadnezzar, and the warning to Belshazzar, and the judgment subsequently executed upon him, we may regard them as evidences of the moral government of God, as Creator, over the several kingdoms of the world, as over the Jews; declared alike in the historical and in the prophetical books of Holy Scripture.

Lastly, I will notice the history of Jonah the prophet. As a whole it is very suggestive, and it illustrates what I have before said as to the cardinal element of Theism, as a foundation truth, viz., God, as Creator, the basis of all subsequent revelations.

The intercourse between Jonah and the mariners is replete with testimony on this point, and with elementary theistic truth. Jonah's testimony to Jehovah as Creator, his directions to them, their act in ultimately following his directions, and his deliverance out of the fish's belly, by God's personal, immediate and transcendent action, as God, are, all, in perfect keeping with the primary elements of theistic truth,—both under natural and under supernatural law. The sneer of the rationalist at what he calls "the venerable fable," is but a manifestation of the wilful wickedness of the sinner who "will not be learned, nor understand"; and who is determined to sin against the law of his own being, and who, by that law will be judged.

I think I may say that I have briefly commented upon, and noticed the most prominent instances of miraculous interventions recorded in the Old Testament, but it is necessary to realize the fact that the miraculous element may be said to be inseparable from all the theistic records. I think it may be said that the antediluvial period was the period of the world's history in which God's moral government thereof was distinguished as a government under natural law;—yet not so absolutely as to altogether denude Theism of its distinctive characteristic; but,—after the flood, there is a marked advance in the presence and operation of the supranatural element, and a developing manifestation of the Divine transcendence and personality; and with

the going down into Egypt we enter upon that period of which it may be truly said that the history of the Jews, as a people, and, as a nation,—from the birth of Moses until the entrance into Canaan was distinguished as one continuous miracle. The visible presence of the Shekinah accompanied them throughout, and this was only the one uniform and constant assertion of God's personality, and of His presence with them, as their God. Other instances of the miraculous may be called collateral and corroborative of this.

Without here dwelling upon the cumulative character of Theistic evidences, we may notice that the several and distinct phases of supernatural manifestations are to be traced to and recognized as immediate interpositions from God, and confirmatory of the primary and fundamental fact of His personality, as First-Cause, Creator and Benefactor, already known as such in and by His works in Creation and Providence.

Archæology has already given to us confirmatory proofs of the reliability of the inspired record, and also of the traditional basis on which the Canon of the Old Testament rests; and at the present day, when the various sceptical and rationalistic theories are obtaining acceptance, even within the Church, such aggressions, as they stimulate faithful souls to renewed study of Biblical literature, such study is progressively leading up to further demonstrations, from archæological sources, that the faith

of the Christian Church, in being based upon the Divine traditions, as embodied by inspiration, in Holy Scripture, is based upon an immovable rock, against which false philosophy and unbelief shall beat in vain.

I have considered the subject of miracles, severally and specifically, for the reason that it is a distinctive "element" of Theism, and also because, as such, it characterizes both the Old and the New Testaments. I have referred to some of the more prominent and marked historic instances, specially because of their connection with epochs of sacred history. In recapitulation of the whole, I will now note the fact that the instances so referred to are not to be regarded as isolated and extraordinary parts of that history, nor is the element itself to be regarded as separable therefrom. It is, in fact, an element as distinguished from an accident in the character and composition of Holy Scripture, as it is a special manifestation of the character and personality of God. The miraculous acts are most intimately allied with the supernatural and personal communications, whether in dreams, visions or revelations, and these, also, with the actings of that Providence and care which marks the transcendent character of the Divine government, as it evidences and discloses the glory of a Divine personality, the Author of Law, and Order, but in no wise limited by such law as is within our ken and analysis. I would, therefore, say that, in summarizing the

miracles of the Old Testament, we may regard such instances as the sun standing still upon Gibeon, the signs given to Gideon, the history of Jonah, and the miracles of Elijah and Elisha, as further and salient points in history, and illustrations of the principle; but, that the miraculous permeates every part thereof, as it is homogeneous with it, and inseparable from it, in the same manner that the historic facts of the Bible interpenetrate those which succeed, and bind all together as one whole.

But, while we may perceive the coherence and essential unity of all the elements of Theism, whether mediate or immediate,—and as it is evident to us that the immediate and direct communications which God has made of Himself are of the most positive character, as they stand related to His supreme perfections, and are the direct acts of His sovereign will,—we can quite understand how repugnant is the principle here asserted to those who lay stress upon God's "immanence" in the laws by which the universe is upheld, and of which we are enabled to have some cognizance. If the essential and pervading distinction of Holy Scripture is, by philosophic criticism, eliminated, we may certainly expect that the verity of miracles, as essentially supernatural acts, and, as declarative of the Divine transcendence and personality, will meet with antagonism; and such is the case. "Lux Mundi" acknowledges and negatively assents to such antagonism. They go so far as to say that "the Church

does not rest its claims upon miracles." Yet, the whole tenor of Holy Writ discloses the fact that, according to the mind of the Most High, the miracles of Scripture are its culminatory evidences, both under the Old and the New Testaments. As a fact, it needs no argument. It is indisputable. It is sufficient to show the contrast and diametrical opposition that exists between philosophic rationalism, or "naturalism,"—by whatever name it may be called —and the teaching of "One living and true God, everlasting," whether revealed in nature, and the human conscience, or by His Holy Word, and by His Incarnate Son.

But, not only is such a contrast established as a negative issue between evolution and elementary theism, but a positive issue must logically follow. The author of "Lux Mundi," and Dr. Flint (although an apologist for Theism) are "in the same boat." The latter says that "the mediæval belief in miracles and the modern belief in law, cannot be held by the same mind, much less by the same society." Is belief in miracles then simply "mediæval," as tantamount to an effete superstition?

Either miracles are not credible, because God,—the Lord Jehovah,—*is not;* or, because the Bible is not historically true, nor plenary inspired, as a revelation given by Him to man.

(1) If the credibility of miracles is attacked from the historical side, as facts, be it the Old, or the New Testament, the whole Book is attacked;

and, not only so, but rejected. Logically, it must be so.

(2) If the Bible is repudiated, or not, so, received as the Book of God, there is no actual basis, afterwards, for belief in a Supreme First-Cause. The God of nature and the God of the Bible is one and the same. The God of nature is so denied by those who deny the Bible, and the universe, from their standpoint, is not His handiwork. The unity between natural and revealed religion is perfect and complete, and cannot be dissolved. From whatever point Theism is attacked, the homogeneity of its elements establishes its unity, and so, its security. In any case, the alternative is,—God, or Atheism.

The facts in the case are these. The Cosmos, throughout, is pervaded by the marvelous; the Bible, as the Book of God, is identified, as it is permeated with the same element; the marvelous, or supernatural, and is, in all its parts, inseparable from it. In like manner miraculous acts are the natural, necessary and spontaneous acts of God's personality, as He is the Supreme and Personal First-Cause, and also the Supreme personal perfection; Uncreated and Eternal.

CHAPTER X

THE LAW OF CONSCIENCE, AS AN ELEMENT OF THEISM

We pass on, now, from the consideration of those theistic evidences which are objective and abstract to that which is subjective, concrete and personal; from the law of external evidence to that which is internal. We have seen, I think, that the objective evidence is not, and has not been partial in respect either to time or place, but that in all ages and to all people God has been, and yet is knowable, albeit that means and opportunities, as part of the Divine economy, differ in degree.

We have now to consider the problem, Is man under all conditions in which he can be placed and in all ages, ontologically, psychically and personally considered, capable of obtaining a saving knowledge of God? In other words, the force and value of the law of conscience, under the conditions of natural law. In solution of this problem I shall have regard to the teaching of Holy Scripture, and to admitted facts of human experience,—chiefly and directly; and I shall endeavor to consider (1) the ontological capacities of the human soul as related to the evidences of a personal God in the

works of creation and providence; and to its powers of moral assimilation; (2) the proper solution of the question why man is ignorant of God, in view of such available evidences; and (3) and lastly, the mandatory power, as connected with the capacity of conscience, as a discriminative faculty, and as related to the determinating power of the will, and so to the formation of character, under Natural Law.

Here we may see that capacity and moral obligation are bound up together; and, as our moral faculties have reciprocal influence upon each other, so also the course of action taken by man upon what he has before known, and personally passed judgment upon, as morally true, or false, good, or evil, will and does certainly affect his power of intellectual, as well as moral discrimination, and so, necessarily, affect the formation of his moral character, actually, and in the eye of God. I say this is true of man's action upon what, after due use, or opportunity of use of the means of knowledge, he considers true, or false, right or wrong; that it will and does affect this knowledge and apprehension of right or wrong, and his affections towards the same; and this as distinguished from the fact itself, in kind, or in degree.

In corroboration of this statement, it is enough to refer to the general teaching of Holy Scripture, and to human consciousness. Wrong-doing does, by an invariable and uniform law of our moral na-

ture, necessarily affect, in the same ratio, our powers of apprehension of truth relating to God, as it affects our powers of moral discrimination between good and evil, and our affections towards the same.

For this reason, as is well known, "the mind," (συνέσις) and "the heart" (καρδια) are, severally used by St. Paul, as synonyms for "conscience" (συνειδήσις), and, as words descriptive of parts of our moral nature, they are used as convertible terms to describe the whole. Thus, St. Paul, in describing the condition of the Ephesians, as unconverted, describes the universal condition of the "natural man," when he says, that they walked "in the vanity of their mind, having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart." The ontological and psychical character of man is here described, as well as his moral nature, as affected by sin, and, so far as elementary and practical knowledge of God is concerned, because of such capacity; and because God has always given objective evidence adequate to the requirements of His moral government, and to the actual necessities of the case. These facts establish the certainty, the justice, the wisdom also, and we may say, even, the beneficence of the Divine government; and the Divine law even in the eye of the creature is recognized as holy, just and good. Moreover, it does away with all doubt, and all contingency, as to the fact itself, viewed from both

standpoints; that is to say, from the ample objective evidence which God has given of Himself, both mediately in the works of creation and providence, and immediately and directly by supernatural agencies, as hereinbefore set forth; and also by the uniform law of man's ontological qualities and moral constitution. But, we have to consider not only the fact of the generic and ontological capacities of man, psychical and moral, by reason of which he is, and has been, universally responsible for evidence, because universally capable of receiving and acting upon it, but we have also to consider the various degrees of such capacities. We may classify them under two heads; that is to say, as educational and external, and as moral and internal capacities, and in both of these aspects of man's being, there are degrees of capacity, and so degrees of force in conscience as an internal, subjective, and personal evidence. I say there are degrees of force, but the fact, itself, is universally true because of generic identity in man. There is but one genus of man, though many species. There are degrees of intellectual cultivation, and of external and objective advantages, and, also, not only various degrees of civilizing, but, also, of religious influences, objective and subjective; but under each and all of these circumstances, and degrees of external influences, there is no case to be found, of which it can be said, "Here is an instance of a race of men in such an epoch of time, that they have

actually no sense whatever of a difference between right and wrong, nor of any measure or kind of moral obligation. Doubtless, the history of this world of ours exhibits most appalling facts, and most amazing contrasts in the character of its inhabitants from many points of view. There are, and there have been races of men, very low, and debased in the scale of intelligence, and of social life, and very low in a state of barbarity, as well as of vice. We have astonishing instances of the plastic characters of the physical nature, and of its capacities of endurance and adaptation, and of the great influence upon it of climatic conditions, and that, both upon the mind and the body. We see that there are great capacities of material and of mental elevation, and of advancement; and also in these respects, of deterioration. We likewise see that, morally and religiously considered, the general and strong tendency is, not upward, but downward, and that such has ever been the record of history. While multifarious forms of superstition and of fanaticism bear sway, the undoubted and eternal principles of truth, of justice, of love and of purity, are ever at a discount, and in a very large, if not increasing minority; and, although the only principles of objective truth that have ever been able, successfully to cope with dominating ill, so as to restrict it, or to minimize its force;—although the gospel of Jesus Christ, and the inspired Word of God, revealing Him as the Saviour and Friend of

man, is preached with the Holy Ghost sent down from Heaven, and is, and has been accompanied by results that cannot be fairly or justly denied; yet,—that these Divine facts and principles (like their Divine subject and Author was in His day) are despised and rejected by the great majority, and they scornfully declare that they will have none of them.

With regard to the external, or objective degrees of advantage, or disadvantage, and, so also of subjective capacity, it is to be said that not only the character of the Divine personality, but also the dogmatic and specific declarations of His inspired law assure us that man shall be dealt with hereafter according to such degrees of advantage, or disadvantage. As He has allowed sin to enter the world, in consequence of man's trial, and, as a further consequence, allowed various ills and evils to obtain, so, the man or woman who comes into the world under the incubus of a dwarfed intellect, and under surrounding circumstances, social and moral, by which he or she is seriously handicapped in the race and warfare of life; and midst all this, as God has not allowed them to be bereft of all moral power, or help, so He will only require of them obedience to such primary, palpable and known laws of truth and right as He has made known and available unto them. Such declaration, clearly, may be made, and of such we may be fully convinced, in reference to what we may call mechanical hindrances to truth and duty.

In regard to the second class, or division to which I have made reference, viz., degrees of moral perception, I have made the distinction between the two classes, with special reference to those tribes and peoples who may be said to be abnormally removed from the rest of the world in intellectual endowments, and social surroundings; in fact what we may properly term exceptional conditions of general disadvantage. This second division will include the great mass of mankind as it comprises, chiefly, those who have not been possessed of the peculiar blessings of God's written and inspired Word. Of them the remarks of Hooker will apply as pertinent. "If then, it is here demanded by what means it should come to pass (the greatest part of God's law moral being so easy for all men to know) that so many thousands of men, notwithstanding, have been ignorant even of principal moral duties, not imagining the breach of them to be sin; I deny not but lewd and wicked custom, beginning perhaps, at the first, amongst few, afterwards spreading into greater multitudes, and so continuing from time to time, may be of force, even in plain things, to smother the light of natural understanding; because, men will not bend their wills to examine whether things wherewith they have been accustomed, be good or evil" (Hooker, Book II, ch. 8, sec. 11). But these remarks of Hooker, and the distinction that I have drawn are both verified in a special manner in

the case of the criminal classes, as a community.

These are separated from the rest of the world, not geographically, but morally. Surrounded, in fact, by Christian light, and knowledge, it shines not to them. They are, to use the strong words of Archdeacon Farrar, "not so much born into the world, as damned into the world," and this description applies not only to the body, but specially to the soul. Children are born into an atmosphere of evil. They grow up from tenderest years, under its awful and blighting influences! What can we say of the law of conscience here? In the same way that we refer the objective fact to the cognizance and moral government of a personal God, so do we, also, refer the subjective and moral results of the fact. All that we can say, or know, is this: God will not require more than He has given. It is enough for us to know this. We have His character, and perfections to rest upon. "The just Lord is in the midst of her; He will not do iniquity." Let this suffice us.

It is the character and power of sin, as a law dominating not only individual men, as its subjects, but societies and races, that accounts for the small measure of force operating by conscience upon man's responsible will as the governing power, of his personal life, as well as obscuring the light of his understanding in relation to moral truth, and religious duty. Neither man, as an individual, nor

societies, nor nations, err through actual ignorance, or lack of knowledge, or of the means of knowledge, but through the controlling power of sense, and of passion, as evil motives. So far as the subjective and internal power of the individual conscience is concerned, or what our Lord and Saviour Himself terms, "the light that is in thee," it is palpably true that what is clearly known to be wrong, and evil, obtains parallel results in the human conscience, now, and under the full measure of gospel light, as it did either under the natural evidences, or under the Mosaic economy. Nay, it is certainly true that the malignity and antagonism of sin is but aggravated by fuller degrees of light, and that the gospel matures the most desperate of all sinners. Men can, and do, under the plainest preaching and the most spiritual, heart-searching and faithful ministry of God's Word, sin most deceitfully, flagrantly and determinedly. It is of these that St. Jude prophetically wrote "These are spots in your feasts of charity, when they feast with you feeding themselves, without fear; clouds they are without water, carried about of winds; trees whose fruit withereth, without fruit, twice dead, plucked up by the roots; raging waves of the sea foaming out their own shame; wandering stars, to whom is reversed the blackness of darkness forever" (Jude 12, 13). St. Peter speaks of the same people in similar terms in the second chapter of his second epistle, and in the thirteenth verse he says

they "shall receive the reward of unrighteousness, as they who count it pleasure to riot in the daytime. Spots they are and blemishes, sporting themselves with their own deceivings, while they feast with you; having eyes full of adultery, and that cannot cease from sin; beguiling unstable souls." "Wells without water, clouds that are carried with a tempest; to whom the mist of darkness is reserved forever" (v. 17).

Not only is the present age of gospel light, and abounding religious privilege and great religious activity, characterized by a generation of presumptuous evil-doers, and scornful unbelievers who are, as adherents of churches, or non-professors of any form of religion, such transgressors as the world has not before seen for audacity and defiant wickedness, but people of a like character are to be found within the pale of Christian profession. Hypocrisy the most deceitful, and moral insensibility and hardihood most amazing, are palpable facts within the knowledge and experience of Christian ministers. It is a matter of painful surprise even to instructed and experimental Christians, that religious knowledge and influences can be so sinned against, and the light and authority of conscience so daringly set at defiance by some who have fully and solemnly espoused all Christian obligations, and who share in the most sacred of Christian privileges. I refer to this fact here in order to demonstrate that the degree of actual force of the law of

conscience operative upon the individual, is not regulated, necessarily and primarily, by the degree of knowledge, but by the moral affections, and as the individual prevailingly loves and, so, chooses and identifies himself with either good, or evil, morally considered; that is to say, with sin, or with holiness. Therefore, while a degree of knowledge of right or wrong is necessary in order to the determination of character, it is not necessary, absolutely, that man should be in possession of a high degree of evidence of elementary Theism, in order either to responsibility, or to happiness. Also, it is to be considered, as Hooker has judiciously observed in regard to the law of reason, as the law peculiarly pertaining to man, and given to him of God for the governance of His life, "Whatsoever we have hitherto taught, or shall hereafter, concerning the force of man's natural understanding, that there is no kind of faculty, or power in man, or any other creature which can rightly perform the functions allotted to it without the perpetual aid, and concurrence of that Supreme Cause of all things" (Hooker, Book II, ch. 9, sec. 1). That is to say, his knowledge or obedience cannot be mechanical, or independent of the personality of God.

Lastly, in this connection, the physical, psychical and moral constitution of man is of that plastic character that, ontologically considered, he is in all these respects, capable of wondrous degrees of development, and manifestation of character and

capacity, specially of moral good, or evil. Such is correspondent with his position and character as a free agent, under moral accountability to his Creator. Also, it is to be noted that the essential elements of knowledge, necessary to a virtuous and holy life, are few and simple. The ultimate and controlling force, in a life of virtue is not, necessarily, knowledge; that is to say, a high degree of knowledge; but character, or moral affection, based upon evidence; and this is self-determined. It is undoubtedly true that moral evil of an inveterate nature opposes man in his way, on every side, both from without, and from within; it is also true that supernatural and Divine help, as provided of God, is at hand to succor and to meet the needs of the true-hearted.

In view of all these facts of man's capacities of body and soul, and of the known moral government of God, there is everything to commend these facts to our full confidence that, in all places, at all times, and under all conditions of human life, "Blessed are all they that put their trust in Him." And, as "He has not left Himself without witness," at any time nor in any part of the world, "He is nigh to all that call upon Him, to all that call upon Him in truth."

At this point it is apposite to compare our positive conclusions as to the ontological capacities of conscience, and man's responsibilities because of it, with the negative position as to the same subject. Here it is apparent that modern pantheism and

modern materialism are in juxtaposition. The pantheistic theology of "Lux Mundi," and the hypothesis of evolution is, manifestly, more in harmony with materialism as to the differential character of the human soul, as related to animal life, than it is to the principles of Biblical Theism which asserts its immortality, and its distinctive generic character, as derived from the immediate hand of God. It is scarcely possible, upon the hypothesis of evolution, as a radical and absolute law of the universe, and as that hypothesis is held by "Lux Mundi," to dissociate the two elements of man's nature, the psychical and the corporal in the application of that hypothesis; both parts of man's nature must be the subjects of evolution, as a force in nature. As I have before said, logically, such a principle denies a personal Creator, but, even upon that incompatible principle which endeavors to reconcile evolution with the Biblical doctrine of Creation, and with the principles of elementary Theism, and allows (as "Lux Mundi" would do), that a personal God is the author and Creator of the "atoms" out of which the earth is "evolved" and also of the protoplasm that is the source of animal life; nevertheless, all the teaching of "Lux Mundi" goes to favor (as indeed their premise requires them to do) the notion that man, as an animal—the whole man—has been "evolved" from the brute creation; consequently, they do not hold that he is possessed, ontologically, and generically, of more radical and distinctive

qualities and capacities, as to his soul, and as a moral agent, which make him, by the law of his creation and the hand of God, both subject to and peculiarly capable of obedience to His moral law, *i. e.*, ontologically considered. In other words, their principle of evolution, as a premise, must logically affect their doctrine as to the law of conscience, and the principles of Natural Religion—as well as of Natural Theology. This, too, logically accounts for and explains why it is that both Natural Religion and Natural Theology have no place, actually and practically, in their system; as well as why they endeavor to maintain that little knowledge of God was imparted to man under the Old Testament, and especially in the earlier ages of the world.

I pass on now to consider (2) the actual cause of ignorance of God, as a subjective quality.

It is because of the fact of man's ontological capacities and moral constitution, and also because of adequate objective knowledge, universally bestowed (although in different degrees), and by reason of which he is justly responsible to his Creator, that ignorance of God is, everywhere, in the Bible, treated as criminal, and chargeable upon man as sin; because such knowledge, including enjoyment of God, he might have had,—moreover it was, also, his duty to seek.

St. Paul said of the Roman world, as heathen, that they were "without excuse," that (intellectually considered) they "knew God, yet they glori-

fied Him not, as God, neither were thankful." That they "did not like to retain God in their knowledge," and that while they knew that those who lived wicked lives were "worthy of death," yet they "not only did the same, but had pleasure in those who did so."

So also are we told in the Book of Genesis, (6 : 12), that "all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth." We are led to infer that it was a wilful act, and done against evidence.

It would appear by some to be tacitly assumed that the wilfulness of sinners, in shutting their eyes to light is something peculiar to those living under Scripture light, specially that of the New Testament, but it is at least gratuitous so to assume. It rests upon a false conception as to the character and force of Natural Religion. The wilfulness of sin has been always chargeable upon man. This is true, notwithstanding the fact of a developed Theism, under the Gospel. The ignorance and atheism of the Old World, as condemned of God, arose from the same cause, as the present corruptions of Christianity, by false philosophy, and "oppositions of science, falsely so called," have arisen; that of wilful ignorance. This fact has, I think been hereinbefore demonstrated that, apart from God's inspired Word, man was, from the beginning possessed of available and sufficient knowledge of God. Also, while I believe the fact is not questioned, it is, as a fact, capable of similar proof that the

ontological and psychical capacities of man, in relation to such objective knowledge and the law of conscience, or the sense of moral responsibility is identical with what we are now possessed of. We may cite, here, the instance of Cain. God's appeal to him in view of his unrighteous anger, is an appeal to his consciousness, as well as to his intellect and moral sense, acknowledging truth and right. "Why art thou wroth, and why is thy countenance fallen? If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? And if thou doest not well, sin, (as a transgression of the known law of right) lieth, or croucheth at the door" (Gen. 6: 7). I interpret it, as Gesenius does, as meaning that so lying, or crouching, it will inflict its own punishment, by moral law. So also we may cite the instance of Abimelech, King of Gerar. There, too, God appeals to his consciousness of the nature of sin, and of its just results, and Abimelech responds to it. He pleads the integrity of his heart, and the innocency of his hands; and God in like manner, as the searcher of hearts, acknowledges his integrity, and accepts his plea.

I have before quoted our Lord's words, in which He appeals to what Hooker calls the second Law Eternal, viz., the law of right, and man's natural capacity of knowing it, "Yea, and why, even of yourselves, judge ye not what is right?" (Luke 12: 57). Our Lord frequently appeals to the same law. "The light that is in thee,"—"take heed that

it be not darkness" (Luke 11 : 35), and in a similar way He refers to objective light, and Himself as its fulness. "Walk, while ye have the Light with you" (John 12 : 25, 26).

We may properly infer that our Lord regarded the objective, and subjective law as universally, and in all ages present, as the rule for the governance of man's life; we may so infer from its language, before quoted. In corroboration of this, the words of Jeremiah (13 : 15), may apply, "Hear ye, and give ear; be not proud, for the Lord hath spoken. Give glory to the Lord your God before He cause darkness, and before your feet stumble upon the dark mountains, and while ye look for light, He turn it into the shadow of death, and make it gross darkness."

In short, our Lord's express language informs us that while a greater degree of knowledge, if sinned against, shall be punished with "many stripes," so, He tells us that a lesser degree shall be sufficient to make man culpable, if he sins against it, and that he shall then be punished with "few stripes"; so also says St. Paul (Rom. 2 : 6–13).

All our experience and observation, and well as the concurrent teaching of Holy Scripture goes to shew that as moral blindness is the result of a sinful habit of life, so, the ignorance for which man will be punishable and punished, hereafter, is an ignorance which he has wilfully and persistently chosen. It is very noticeable, as it is very pertinent

to our argument, that this is regarded as an axiom in all the discourses of Job, and his friends, viz., that at that day, as God was knowable, so, sin against Him was inexcusable, and worthy of punishment. We are justified in declaring that our Lord intended to assert an absolute and invariable moral law when He said, "Every one that doeth evil, hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved, but he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest that they are wrought in God" (John 3 : 20, 21). We thus conclude that the blindness of conscience present with polytheists was not a result of uncertain, or inadequate means of objective knowledge of God, but, that their intellectual, as well as their moral perception, "their foolish heart," as St. Paul terms it, was defiled and darkened, by their following, as Hooker states, the law of passion, rather than the law of reason, and what was peculiarly given them of God for the guidance of human life.

We have considered (1) the capacities, and, so, the sufficiency of the subjective law of conscience, as exercised upon the objective evidences of God's character and will, apart from an inspired and written law. Herein I have had regard, chiefly, to the ontological and psychical qualities of the human soul, as capable of assimilating and appropriating truth and knowledge, both of an intellectual and moral character, concerning God and His will.

(2) I have endeavored to shew that personal and subjective ignorance of God is, in all times and under all circumstances, a moral result of disobedience to the law given of God to govern human life and action, *i. e.*, the law of reason as contrasted with that of passion and sinful appetite. It is now fitting to state the mandatory power of conscience, or its authority to govern men. (3) As addressed to moral agents, by a moral governor who is, in Himself, the centre and source of law, this mandatory power is based upon truth and knowledge, and, as it is the truth and knowledge concerning God Himself, as Creator, and Benefactor, it is the knowledge of right and wrong. This truth is presented to and acquired by an inherent and ontological faculty of moral consciousness, which responds on God's behalf within us, and with an indisputable authority, enforces the claims of such truth upon us, and says we *ought* to do it. It speaks in no uncertain tones, of duty, and, while it does not compel the action of the will, it warns and admonishes and it promises, according to the action that is taken upon the evidence given, objectively and generally and subjectively and personally, and, so, sealed with the responsibility of personal relationship to the soul of the individual man. What I have to assert, and to maintain, in this connection, is that in both these aspects, (1) as to the capacities of conscience, intellectually and morally considered, and (2) as to its mandatory power and authority to hold

man responsible, the evidence given, anterior to revelation, is deficient in no element essential to Theism, and to the just judgment of God over man, as a fallen being, and under probation for a future life. It is sufficient to state that, while the reciprocal influence of all man's moral faculties is charged with the evidences objectively declaring, and revealing God's character, and will, and that those evidences (hereinbefore considered) are of a most pervasive character, the self-determining power of man's will is declared and magnified, as it is, progressively, and ultimately, exercised upon such evidences, not only now, under a revealed and written Word, and a published and preached gospel, but under the law of Natural Theology, and its concomitant evidences, anterior to the Mosaic law and ritual, and to Christianity.

I shall now contrast the conclusions I have arrived at as to the principles of Elementary Theism, with the New Theodicy, having for its basis the hypothesis of evolution. In that theodicy, Natural Theology and Natural Religion have, practically, no place; there is, in them, supposed to be no Theistic evidence. So, also, in the supernatural evidences we have, hitherto, considered; they also are ignored. The primitive conceptions of God,—as required by their premises—are assumed to be in favor of polytheism. The nature of God, as an objective truth is, so "evolved" from polytheistic conceptions, and is so treated. The inspired Word,

as a revelation from God, is actually "fused" in this theodicy, with the speculations of philosophic moralists, and regarded as one with philosophy, and what are assumed to be scientific and intellectual truths, in general; and experts and specialists in these departments are regarded as inspired.

Faith in God, and in revealed truth; that is to say in Bible truth, is necessarily mutable, as it declares the faith of the church, because, both objectively and subjectively it is in a state of constant evolution. As it is essential to the hypothesis of evolution, as applied to Theology, to depreciate the evidence from Natural Theology, and from Natural Religion, so is it also necessary to their hypothesis to belittle the Old Testament, as a revelation from God; and, therefore, to base all definite and dogmatic teaching upon the New Testament, and the Incarnation. Also, as these sources of Theistic knowledge are belittled, so, also, in conformity with the hypothesis of cosmical development, and the assumption that man was "evolved" from an ape, primitive man must have had not only a very inferior intellect, but also very little power of moral perception, or conscience. Thus objective and subjective ignorance, in the early history of the world, is made to square with the theory of evolution. On this principle we can account for the judgment of Mr. Illingworth who says ("Lux Mundi," pp. 168–69), "Then there is the rash orthodoxy that is over eager to accept any result that tallies with

its own preconceived opinion; as for instance that belief in primitive monotheism. No doubt several very competent authorities think that the present evidence points in that direction, but a majority of critics, equally competent, think otherwise." No doubt, upon the preconceived theory of evolution, Mr. Illingworth so concludes, but, in antithesis to this theory, we hold, as orthodox Theists, the reasonable faith of a primitive monotheism. We hold to the statement of Holy Scripture, that "God made man unright, but they have sought out many inventions." And we are, in so doing, supported by ample evidence that an objective and declared monotheism was the primitive and universal creed of mankind, and so held until man had "corrupted his way upon the earth," and darkened his reason, by wilful disobedience thereunto, as unto the law given him of God to govern his life; as Hooker, Aristotle, St. Augustine, and Plato have declared (Hooker, Book II, Ch. 8, sec. 6, 7, 8, 9).

Although there has, as ordained of God, been a law of progression, and development of theistic evidences, and of a primitive monotheism; and a correspondingly increased moral obligation, accompanying such development, we deny in toto the premises of cosmical evolution, as the radical law of creation, with the evolution of man, physical and psychical; and also the false and essentially atheistic principle underlying the theory of evolution, and so declared in the disloyal and destructive

theodicy by which not only is the Old Testament, as a revelation from God, belittled, but, also, the teaching of our Divine Lord is, to say the least, irreverently and injuriously misstated and detracted from.

Finally, to summarize the evidences we have hitherto considered,—and the results.

I think it may be said we have had complete proof that God has given to man—apart from the written law of Holy Scripture—in the mediate revelations afforded in His works in nature and also in and by the immediate and supernatural revelations of His Divine personality which He has vouchsafed to mankind, ample evidence to instruct man, as a moral agent, and ample encouragement to those who would sincerely seek Him. We may say, however, that God's requirement of man is one that is highly rational, highly necessary and just, as it is both a simple and a moral requirement. "He that cometh to God must believe that He is." The evidence does not and cannot—sufficient though it be—compel belief, yet it both justifies it and, also, requires it.

There is, besides, another requirement, equally necessary, and indispensable. This is, that he shall "diligently seek Him." To such He is a rewarder; but to such, only. The seeking that is requisite must engage the whole man; all his moral faculties. The object is worthy of them all. This requirement obtains in all ages, and under all conditions.

We may see that the determinative quality, and, so, that which is assimilative—which by act and habit forms human character, and shapes human destiny, fixes the responsibility of the individual man; because, under the conditions of human sinfulness, or bias to sin, supernatural and personal aid has always been present and available to help man in obeying the law of his being, *i. e.*, the law of reason, as sustained and emphasized by supernatural evidences. It is further to be considered (and this fact I desire to emphasize) that it is the action of conscience, and of the determinative faculty that stamps character. The argument of St. Paul in the thirteenth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, in reference to eating of meat that had been offered to idols, may, I think, be held to be applicable, absolutely, and universally, as defining the power and authority of the law of conscience, and also as declaring that the action taken internally in the inner chamber of the soul, is the criterion of character and final rule of God's judgment. Conscience indeed (though never independent of objective evidence) is, after all, the controlling factor in human life, and of its future results in the great hereafter.

Admit—as we must and do—the great value of objective truth, in regard to the measure of such evidences, it is not the measure or the excellency thereof that is the preponderating or controlling force in forming man's moral character. This is, I

think, an undoubted fact, although it is, in general too little apprehended. The all-wise government of God has so ordered the moral economy of this world in which we live, that under the most disadvantageous conditions none should be left without witness, or evidence in all that is actually essential to guide and to govern him, so that he may pass through and out of a world of moral trial, in a state of moral and spiritual fitness, as a free, responsible and tried moral agent, for a future and blessed life in the presence of God; and this result is not governed by the degree of objective evidences.

There is a necessary minimum of such evidence, and this minimum is, in no case, wanting. The moral agency of the individual is, in every case, a prime factor. "There is no difference between the Jew and the Greek; the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon Him" (Rom. 10: 12).

Appendix

CHAPTER I

NOTE A

Negative Argument for the Personality of God

THE argument against modern philosophic theories, or "Naturalism," is well stated by Mr. Balfour in Part I, and Part II of his book, "Foundations of Belief." Mr. Balfour recognizes, at the outset, that the subject involves, not alone the intellect, but the moral nature of man. He shews that the results of the naturalistic philosophy include only material and physical law, and that conscience and moral law are ignored and virtue denied. Further, that by this process of argument there can be no combination of biology, and ethics. He also shews that "naturalism," practically denies free-will, and, so, human responsibility.

In relation to æsthetics, Mr. Balfour shews that naturalism, or mechanical materialistic philosophy gives no adequate explanation of this quality of the human soul, by which it apprehends and appreciates the beautiful. There is no intrinsic and essential quality of beauty by which it can be, so, philosoph-

ically demonstrated, and, such an apprehension can only be by a faculty of the human mind. It cannot be independent of the taste of the observer. As to music, advance in the art and science of music does not entail advance in the effects produced by it. As to taste in dress, the natural tendency to agreement consequent herein tends to form both taste and habit in all minor things; while in the higher relations of thought, the sense of beauty must find another source and original—its prime origin is to be found in God. It is a just intuition of the human mind that coordinates the true, the beautiful and the good.

I give a quotation on this point. "However little, therefore, we may be prepared to accept any particular scheme of metaphysical æsthetics, and most of them appear to me very absurd, we must believe that somewhere, and for some Being, there shines an unchanging splendor of beauty, of which in nature, and in art we see, each of us from our own standpoint, only passing gleams and stray reflections, whose different aspects we cannot now coordinate, whose import we cannot fully comprehend, but which, at least, is something other than the chance play of subjective sensibility, or the far-off echo of ancestral lusts. No such mystical creed can, however, be squeezed out of observation and experience; science cannot give it us; nor can it be forced into any sort of consistency with the naturalistic theory of the universe" (pp. 65, 66).

Mr. Balfour summarizes the results of naturalism, as a system, as follows,—"If naturalism be the whole truth, then is morality but a bare catalogue of utilitarian precepts, beauty the chance occasion of passing pleasure, reason but the dim passage from one set of unthinking habits to another" (p. 77).

It is here to be observed that the idea of the beautiful, as an objective entity, and necessary to the human mind, goes to shew that man is ontologically, as well as with reference to moral qualities of his nature, made in the image of God, and this correlation of his distinctive ontological being to the peculiar characteristics of the Divine personality, are facts which are clearly at variance with the theory of evolution, as held by materialistic writers of the present day.

In Part II Mr. Balfour shews that naturalism, as a system, has, and can have no philosophic basis. According to naturalism, experience is necessary in order to certainty, but a system for the universe cannot rest, philosophically, on an individual basis. Also, there is no absolute uniformity in nature, and there can be no universal law of causation. There is, therefore, no philosophic certitude possible to naturalism. In relation to authority, and reason, Mr. Balfour says of the traditional belief of Right and Wrong, as summarizing morality, that it is "beyond individual criticism"; so also, "The moral sense of mankind indicates the existence of absolute authority."

Moreover naturalism makes no provision for the ethical part of man's nature. It must, however, be said that while the negative argument of Mr. Balfour is entirely satisfactory and logically sound, the same cannot be said of the constructive, or positive part of his book; and in passing from the negative to the positive he does not logically proceed to argue from the premises which he has established; the proper outcome of which should be,—not a scheme of "provisional philosophy,"—apparently upon the basis of evolution as a universal law, and subjective in character, but the great, primary and objective truth of the personality of God.

NOTE B

Positive Argument for the Personality of God

We have seen, in the epitome given of Part I and Part II of Mr. Balfour's book, that the works of nature, and man's ontological qualities, as an integral part of nature, do not bear out and justify the naturalistic hypothesis of a universal law of development as the law of nature; and, specially that such naturalistic hypothesis makes no recognition of the ethical part of man's ontological qualities. I shall, now, epitomize some of the positive evidence for a personal Creator, as source and origin of the universe. For this purpose I choose, chiefly, the

salient points, or some of them, contained in the Duke of Argyle's work, "The Unity of Nature."

A main and a comprehensive truth introductory to the subject is found in the fact that, under multiform laws, we are able to trace a universal and a perfect adaptation of means to a particular end. In reference to inorganic nature, the author shews that there is, often, a relation of one law to another, although that relation is, more or less obscure. Such are the relations of ether to radiant heat, to chemical affinity, and also to galvanism and electricity. So of the laws of sound. It is probably true that, as ether is intimately, although obscurely, related to the former elements, that it is so related to sound. The same may be said to be true of solar light. These are separate and separable forces, yet capable of chemical affinity. In relation to organic nature, a second and a salient truth is to be noticed, *i. e.*, that protoplasm does not represent or explain life, as a separate force; it only represents the modus-operandi of life. Further, man is included in the unity of nature, in the element of his body, and in the one principle of life, as before stated. Concerning animal instinct as related to the mind of man, there is, in such instinct, a perfect adjustment, a mechanism adapting means to end, but, in their case, it is unconscious obedience to law. Animal instinct is not derived from experience; it is innate and hereditary. It is what it always was; it is not evolved, but Divinely created. All emotions of

man are present in animals, except thought or reason. Purpose, also, belongs to organic movements of animals, but it is outside of themselves. In man there is a combination of reason and intuitive animal instinct; so the author considers. It is, perhaps, more correct to say that there is an analogy between the intuition of animals and the intuition of man, generally; but, specially, with regard to the animal part of his nature, where his reason is not sensibly called into exercise.

In regard to the distinctive ontological character of man's being, several things are to be considered. (1) Man is conscious of his own limitations; also we can understand the limitations of the irrational creatures, and we know the nature of their desires. (2) There is an evident contrast between man and the animals in this, *i. e.*, that the desires of the rational creature are, here, never fully satisfied. In regard to man, as he is related to the Divine Author of his being, (*a*) our finite mental capacities give us not merely a sense of abstract infinity, but, also, of an Infinite Being; (*b*) the correlation of matter and force suggests the same truth, *i. e.*, not only of infinite power, but also of an Omnipotent Being; (*c*) the human mind, as an integral part of nature, as a system, enables man under its laws to receive and to interpret objective evidence in nature (Isaiah 23 : 28 *ad finem*). The laws of the human mind are in harmony with the unity of nature. The order of thought under which the human mind

renders intelligible to itself all the phenomena of the universe, is not an order that invents, but an order, simply, that feels and sees. In relation to the moral capacities of man, the supreme faculties of the mind stand related to purpose,—in ourselves and in others.

The understanding of man, as related to ends; and the moral sense as it recognizes the law of righteousness, and the ultimate authority on which it rests. Bishop Butler, in his sermon on "the ignorance of man," says that the highest degree of knowledge attainable by man is "the author, the means and the end in the system of nature." The intelligibility of nature is coextensive with the whole range of man's intelligence, the higher and the lower; those which perceive the reason of things must be included, as well as those which perceive their causes, merely.

It is true indeed that this perception does not reach the rank of an ultimate truth, for the simple reason that, high as the faculties are which require the reason of a thing, there are other faculties which seek to know where that reason,—that Logos —is seated, and where the place of its habitation. In relation to the "atom" of modern science, a contrast is suggested with it and the atom of the ancients. Prof. Clarke Maxwell, following up the dictum of Sir G. Herschel, says that "each molecule throughout the universe bears impressed upon it the stamp of a metric system, as distinctly as does

the meter of the archives at Paris, or the double royal cubit of the Temple at Carnac."

The Duke of Argyle mentions the fact that the chemical combinations that man can effect in the inorganic kingdom of nature are artificial in character, while living organisms, alone, represent chemical affinity. "Chemical combinations of the organic can only exist in living beings." Chemical composition is one thing, and organic structure is another. There is a radical difference between chemical combinations effected by nature in living organisms, and chemical composition in the organic world. Every animal organism is structure through and through. "Its whole substance, and, as it were, its whole essence is structure and nothing else." The Duke illustrates the difficulties of the hypothesis of evolution, from the case of the chrysalis and the butterfly, showing that this does not harmonize with the rudimentary theory as to organs for future use. "Also, there is here no struggle for existence, and no development of germ." Yet, as he says, and as says also Sir Wm. Dawson, Creation and Evolution are not mutually exclusive, but harmonious and complimentary, *i. e.*, there is no such thing as an absolute and universal law of evolution in nature.

The solution of the problem of the origin of all things is well stated as follows,—"Under whatever cloud of words men may endeavor to conceal it, our recognition of this universal fact and law in the

genesis of organic functions is the recognition of mind by mind; the recognition by the human mind of operations which are intelligible to it only because they are operations having a close analogy with its own." Hence, he argues, very properly, that mind in man represents the supernatural, or is the creative work of God.

Against the proposition of materialism, which would exclude man from the unity of nature, the testimony of Professor Agassiz is quoted, who says, "The truth is that life has all the wealth and endowment of the most comprehensive mental manifestations and none of the simplicity of physical phenomena." These considerations shew, first, that as the human mind is the highest created thing of which we have any knowledge, its conceptions of what is greatest, in the highest degree, must be founded on what it knows to be the greatest and highest, in itself; and secondly, that we have no difficulty in understanding how this image of the Highest may and must be faint, without being at all unreal or untrue" ("Unity of Nature," pp. 155–56). Also, "All we know, and all the processes of thought by which this knowledge is acquired, involve and imply the truth that our mind is, indeed, made in some real sense in the image of God, although intellectually its powers are very limited, and morally its condition is very low" (p. 186).

I add some remarks from the same author as to the moral qualities of man. First, he shews that

there is a correlation of the intellectual and moral faculties. The desire for knowledge is innate in man, also, the sense of ignorance, and, in some degree, the sense of unworthiness. The sense of ignorance, though necessary, and defining man's place in nature, is negative; the sense of unworthiness is positive. The sense of right and wrong is innate in man; so also of responsibility. "I ought," is incapable of analysis and reduction. It is simple and inherent. Conscience, or the mandatory faculty in conscience, is concurrent with and interdependent with other faculties of the soul, as memory and understanding." The author shews that all relative and human authority, parental, social, civil, and religious, has its seat and original in the personality of God, and that all relations of life, as well as every part of the system of nature, are permeated by a Supreme Mind, and by a Supreme Authority.

I have thus epitomized that portion of the Duke of Argyle's admirable book which bears directly on Natural Theology, and a Personal Creator, evidenced in nature. There are other parts of it which I have not referred to. I would also notice that the thoroughly logical essay of the late Principal Tulloch of Aberdeen, on Theism, starts from the same premises, *i. e.*, Mind in Nature as evidencing Creative Mind. He logically follows the evidence through inorganic and organic nature and makes all to culminate in the moral intuitions of man;

evidence that modern science does not regard as an entity!

Materialists of this kind who bely or degrade the moral sense in man, often decry what they call anthropomorphism; they, themselves, manifest an anthropomorphism of a most absurd and indisputable character, when they deify the dim light of intellectualism, and exclude not only moral sense and obligation, and moral affection, but also what is peculiarly the *ego*, characteristic of man, *i. e.*, the will power. In such conceptions of the primary good and origin of all things, man, in so judging of the Supreme Cause, not only judges of Him by himself, but he takes an ex-parte view of his own nature as it is a true witness to the Divine handiwork, as it is to the Divine perfection and personality. It may be said that the correlation of nature and the human mind is self-evident. It is only mind in man, that enables him to trace mind in nature by analogy of his own highest and most distinctive experience and ontological qualities. These not only enable him to see mind in nature, but they direct him to the necessary fact that he is, himself, within the unity of nature, as it discloses a Personality who is the author of it all. More than this; these premises which establish an all-perfect Personality, include in that Personality all the faculties found in man as a self-conscious being. Thus, our modern philosophers are illogical and unphilosophical when they reason from ex-parte premises.

As the ethical part of man's nature is not accounted for satisfactorily upon utilitarian principles, and as the human mind includes moral qualities, as an element of its being which finds its complementum in, and is finally represented by the will, as the Ego, so, by a just inference and analogy they must, in argument, admit the absolute authority and Supreme Will, as the legitimate and true expression of the Supreme Mind. We may thus arrive at a correct estimate of the place of miracles in the economy of God's government of the universe. It is only by an ex-parte pantheistic and mechanical interpretation of nature that we can deny the fact or possibility of miracles. The materialist points to the inexorable character of law, in nature; the necessity and inviolability of law, so far as man can trace or understand it, is not absolute, but relative.

A supreme mind involves not only infinite and perfect wisdom and power in the formulation of law, and which as the source of law cannot be traced by the finite intelligence to the final cause, by the sequences of nature, but, as it includes all ethical qualities, so also it includes a supreme and determinating will that is correlated to all the other elements and attributes of His being, in perfect unity of character, as well as perfectness of relation; and, so, adjudges and determines His actions and His government of the universe, not necessarily, or mechanically, but freely and absolutely, accord-

ing to the freedom and transcendence of His personality and supreme perfections. Mr. Proctor, author of "Other Worlds Than Ours," seems to leave this out of view when he argues that an all-perfect Mind, as He knows all the past and all the future, could or should ordain perfect laws which would not require His personal intervention. This is illogical reasoning. Not only may the sovereign and all-perfect will of the Creator properly ordain otherwise, as His sovereign and perfect knowledge and judgment of all the facts may see it good to do, and as His all-perfect power enables Him to do, but—from the highest analogy that we can make the basis of our estimate of the Supreme Good—His Supreme Personality should, we may reverently say, so express itself in the exercise of that all-perfect will, and in its manifestation to all His universe, declaring thereby His ineffable and supreme perfections.

I here subjoin the latest deliverance of science on the subject of the Origin or Prime Cause of all things. Lord Kelvin, the president, at this date, of the British Association for the advancement of science has given an official deliverance in the form of a protest, and in the name of science, against what he designates as "Scientific Atheism." The immediate *outcome*, from a literary and theological standpoint, of Lord Kelvin's deliverance is concisely summarized in an article in the London *Tablet;* and for this reason I give it *verbatim*, with a few intro-

ductory remarks. This utterance of Lord Kelvin's is a sufficient, as it is an authoritative utterance by one who has a legitimate title to speak in the name, and on the behalf of science; and his utterance may properly be described as explosive of the *hypothesis* of Cosmical Evolution, and by consequence, and at the same time of the so-called Theological System of "Lux Mundi," which is based upon Evolution, because it, again, declares the *basis* of the hypothesis of Evolution to be no basis at all, as it has indeed no *existence*, in truth, and in fact, and as it is, *really*, what it audaciously and falsely declares the Bible account of Creation given in the Book of Genesis to be, *i. e.*, mythical; a *pure fabrication.*

Lord Kelvin's recent statement that Science is compelled to affirm the existence of Creative Power is dealt with as follows in *The Tablet:*

Lord Kelvin, the greatest of living scientists, has recently made the statement that so far is science from denying Creative Power, or from considering the supreme fact, the being of Deity, beyond her scope, that she positively affirms the existence of Creative Power. The words of this "prince of science" have led to a long and significant controversy in the *Times*, where he has been attacked on three occasions by a leading botanist, on two by a prominent mathematician and freethinker, and lastly, in a letter a column long, by a distinguished zoologist, Prof. Ray Lankester. Several others

have joined in, and the *Times* has published an excellent editorial article on this, the highest subject of human thought.

It is more than desirable to consider the problem which has led Lord Kelvin to this bald assertion. It is the origin and source of life on our planet. And the first fact of interest at the present moment is that none of Lord Kelvin's antagonists have offered the smallest suggestion as to the solution of this problem. Whilst denying Creative Power, they have no alternative to suggest. Nor has one of them had the honesty to admit the absolute and unrelieved ignorance of biology—the science of life—as to the origin of its subject-matter.

Let us, therefore, make examination into the ground of Lord Kelvin's words. And the first question to be asked is whether living are absolutely distinct from the non-living things at this hour. There has ever been talk of "spontaneous generation." A Frenchman has described "cells of gelatin" which only needed a "something" to make them live. An Indian professor has declared that he can obtain living responses from a strip of tin as readily as from a strip of living muscle, and so forth ad nauseam. Now it may be positively asserted that all such statements are utterly worthless. It is, on the other hand, the universally admitted and fundamental dogma upon which biology, physiology, and medicine are built that every living thing is descended from some living an-

cestor. The great Harvey, who discovered the circulation of the blood, formulated the dictum, "omne vivum ex ovo," every living thing is from an egg. This is unquestionably true; but Virchow, the founder of modern pathology, gave us further detail. Every living thing on the earth, whether a microbe or an oak, an oyster or a horse, is composed of units called cells, and, as Virchow taught us, "omnis cellula e cellula," every living cell is derived from a preexistent living cell. Now these are established truths, which have never been seriously called in question since their formulation.

This being granted, let us go further. Astronomy and geology have shown that the surface of the earth was once fluid, and was covered with rolling tides of molten lava. Obviously no life could then exist. Lord Kelvin himself will always be remembered as the great mathematician and physicist who calculated that it must be about one hundred millions of years since the earth's crust was formed. It being granted then, that life cannot be manufactured now, and that life had a beginning on the earth, science makes enquiry as to how the beginning was effected. Lord Kelvin refers us to Creative Power; speaking from the scientific standpoint. But the vast majority of scientists are against him. It is fair, then, to enquire what they have to offer.

There are only two theories. Both are absolutely worthless. This bold statement is made not

as a matter of personal opinion, but as the general verdict of science itself.

The first was no more than a flight of imagination; and we owe the bold jeu d'esprit to none other than Lord Kelvin himself. He suggested, many years ago, that the first living matter had been brought to our planet, at some distant age, by a meteorite or comet which had borne it from another world. Obviously this merely transferred the site of the problem to Mars or Jupiter, or anywhere else. It was no solution. Nor, for many other reasons, is it for one moment tenable. It remains, in the eyes of Lord Kelvin himself and every one else, as no more than a daring but baseless idea.

The second explanation is equally worthless, but much more plausible and much more specious. It is generally accepted by ignorant atheists, but is entirely ignored by scientists, atheistic or other. Even the hot critics of Lord Kelvin, who would give anything for a theory that would cast discredit on the belief in Creative Design, have not stooped to mention this outrageous piece of presumption, which is known as the Carbon-theory of Haeckel, the notorious German pantheist. The Carbon-theory, which his ignorant followers regard as constituting Haeckel's title to immortal fame, is very simple in statement. It asserts that Carbon has life potentially within it; that long ago, it took unto itself, under conditions not now re-reproduc-

ible, the other necessary elements, oxygen, hydrogen, and nitrogen, and made the first living thing, or "protist," as Haeckel calls it. We desire to avoid cumbersome detail, but a few words are justified wherewith to expose the error and audacious ignorance of this theory. Haeckel is a zoologist of distinction; but his knowledge of the chemistry of living matter is second hand, being dealt with by a separate department of science of which he has no personal knowledge. So obvious is this, that Haeckel has actually omitted all mention of two elements, sulphur and phosphorus, which are invariably present in "protoplasm" or living matter, and the latter of which is the most essential constituent of the nucleus, which, in its turn, is the most essential part of the living cell. There is no space to describe the numberless other fallacies in the theory, which is, indeed, no theory, nor even an hypothesis; but a tissue of deception. It is surely terrible to realize that thousands of copies are selling for a few pence in England to-day of a chapter of "science falsely so-called" which would make Carbon—a diamond, or the core of a "lead" pencil, or a lump of coal—the source of life; would make Carbon God.

The subject is illimitable; but here and now is set down the deliberate assertion of a professional biologist that neither his own nor any other branch of science has the slightest knowledge of any other source of life than the Almighty. Lord Kelvin is a

physicist, not a biologist. His opponents, therefore, deny his right to an opinion. This article is written by a biologist to show that the science of life has for the source of life no other name than God.

Supplementary to the above I will quote two passages from the editorial in the London *Times* of May 13th.

The first is a sentence from Lord Kelvin's deliverance, selected by the editor to state Lord Kelvin's position, *i. e.*, "Scientific thought is compelled to accept the idea of creative power."

The second quotation I will make is a sentence from Darwin, quoted by "T. C. F." *i. e.*, "No evidence worth anything has, as yet, been advanced in favor of a living being being *developed* from inorganic matter."

These two sentences describe, negatively, and positively, the *place*, and the *value* of evolution as *a* law in the economy of Nature. It is relative and not absolute, in its extent; or, as the late Sir Wm. Dawson phrased it, "not exclusive but complementary."

The law of evolution, as known to science is not absolute in character, nor is it exclusive of creative power. *This* is the negative statement of *science;* and, as *such* a deliverance, it is all sufficient.

It is all that logicians, or that Biblical Theists can desire at its hands; anything further is beyond its sphere, or its ability. It is sufficient for us to say that, with our adversaries rests the *onus pro-*

bandi; and, that the negative involves the positive. I agree with the editor of the *Times* that the argument *from the atoms themselves*, as manufactured articles, is, in itself, sufficient as related to the claims of Theism.

NOTE C

Evolution and Elementary Theism

I will, first, summarize the theory of evolution as it stands opposed, directly or indirectly, to Biblical Theism. Some who advocate the theory of evolution are avowed unbelievers in God, and in the Bible. In holding to cosmical development, they do not admit a personal First-Cause in creation; they are, therefore, materialistic pantheists. The atoms out of which the earth was "evolved" are themselves uncaused. Herbert Spencer admits that such is the logical result of the principles of evolution, as an absolute law in regard to the origin of the universe. Others endeavor to reconcile the principles of cosmical evolution with belief in a personal First-Cause, and, in so doing, they are obliged to come in conflict, not only with the Old Testament Scriptures, but with the teaching and even with the personality of our Lord and Saviour.

Such is the position assumed by "Lux Mundi," as it represents what is known as the Higher Criticism. "Lux Mundi" holds the principle of cosmical devel-

opment, and, therefore, inferentially holds the development of man from the animals. It does not explicitly say so, but it considers such development to be very probable. In a similar way, the trend of its teaching is that monotheism, or belief in the Lord Jehovah, was evolved from polytheism, which is supposed to have been the primitive faith of mankind. In consequence of the general hypothesis, it is found requisite to deny the authenticity and veracity of at least a portion of the book of Genesis, because the acknowledgment thereof as historic facts would militate against the theory of evolution; as does also the doctrine of native depravity, as a consequence of the temptation, and the fall of man. For the same reason, they profess to find a great similarity, if not an actual unity, in all the early religious beliefs.

As a consequence of this position, the teaching of the Old Testament, as well as the superstitions of the heathen nations, requires to be purged by morality, in order to get rid both of error and of immorality in its teachings. The principle of evolution is applied to the "fusion" of philosophy with religion, in order to such purification, and to evolve truth from such fusion. The same principle of evolution that requires theism to be evolved from polytheism, and that requires the denial of the veracity of the Old Testament, denies that there is any foundation for dogmatic theism before the Incarnation of Christ. It is to be added that such

fusion is, they say, necessary in order to purify our idea of God. In this they admit that our conception of the Supreme Being stands connected with His transcendence, and with His dwelling-place in heaven, as the especial and peculiar seat of His glory. If we ask why they would "purify," or alter such conception, the answer is that they assert and magnify His immanence in the universe, and, practically, they identify Him with it, or, with such of its laws as are known to and understood by man. Herein, they make the same endeavor to do away with the supernatural in nature, even as they seek to do away with it in Holy Scripture, by denying to it that special and unique inspiration which makes it in any proper sense the Book of God; and by which they seek to fuse with it science and philosophy and all natural truths, as homogeneous in character and as elements of religion and religious truth.

Based upon the Incarnation, and as a result from it, or at least connected with it, is evolution as applied to the mind of man. Not intrinsically, by its own power, but, as is conjectured, by the work upon it of the Holy Ghost, there is an "evolution" of knowledge, as part of a Divine economy. "The power that impels, impels (say they) all thinking things." Consequent upon this, scientific enquiry, in all directions, is, in fact, an inspiration, and it is ever advancing. Yet, while they admit that Christianity is also final in character, they would actually

emasculate, at least, some of its doctrines, and specially the substitutionary character of the Atonement of Christ, is a doctrine that requires to be purged away by the fusion of Jewish and Greek thought, or by philosophic morality.

The personal and human knowledge of our Lord is depreciated, and even His official testimony is so explained as to compromise His fidelity to truth. As the Atonement is, virtually, deprived of its efficacy, so the doctrine of human depravity is denied, and the doctrine of sinless perfection is taught in the form of subjective evolution of character. The transcendency of God's government of the world is virtually neutralized by their doctrine of "immanence." This is required, because they minimize, or neutralize the supernatural element in creation, providence and history. By this principle the inspiration of the Scriptures, also, is reduced to a nullity. Such are the salient results of the principle of evolution, as held by "Lux Mundi," and they afford a comprehensive idea of its character as a theodicy. Each of the subjects referred to will come up hereafter. It must be added, here, that connected with this elaborate metaphysical pantheism, is the sacramental theory of the church, which is the primary feature of the Romish system. This theory is fully asserted in "Lux Mundi." Actually and practically, according to its teaching, inspiration resides in the church, and "the church and Christian consciousness" must (they say) deter-

mine how much of the Scriptures is to be believed, and in what sense.

I have given a synoptical view of evolution, and its results, as a theodicy, held by men who profess to be both Christians and theologians. I propose, now, to state the attitude of elementary and Biblical Theism as related to and as contrasted with it, and specially in reference to the elementary evidences of theism, viz., the being and personality of God, as Creator and Governor of the World. Beginning then with the argument for the Divine existence, and with His creative work, it is to be said that in this, and in the truths based upon it, although the fact is set forth, as a fact, grounded on sufficient, valid and rational evidence; Theists whose theology is consistently grounded on the Bible as a revelation from God, do not hold their theism to require demonstration, or philosophic proof in order to its validity, as true. Various Christian apologists have formulated arguments, or analogies which, while declaring the Divine existence and personality to be highly consistent with all that is rational, yet, if philosophically examined, would involve pantheism. We may say, therefore, from these facts, and from intrinsic consideration, or the nature of the subject, and also from the language of Holy Scripture in Heb. 11: 2, "He that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him;" but that such demonstration is incompatible both

with the Divine purpose in His moral government, and with the intrinsic fitness of things, because of the subject matter, and because of the nature of man as a moral agent, under probation, that such demonstration should be presented, or capable of presentation. It may, in fact, be said to be incompatible with the nature of God, and with the character of man, *i. e.*, with his ontological character and capabilities. But, although it is not requisite that the evidence should, as in the case of philosophy, and mathematics, amount to absolute proof and demonstration, it is requisite that it be of such a character and extent as may entitle it, as moral truth, to acceptance by a moral agent. Evolution, as it is actually based upon philosophy, or rather philosophic speculation, and as it is purely a mental conception, and hypothesis, aims at certitude; but it is intellectual, or mechanical certitude, and absolute necessity. It is a palpable fact that man's intellectual capacities are finite; as this suggests, an infinite intelligence, so, it evidences natural incapacity to measure the infinite, or to comprehend it; demonstration, both of the being of God and of all the truths consequent upon that being is intrinsically impossible. That such demonstration is inherently incompatible with the requirements and circumstances of the case, we will consider more fully hereafter. But, while such demonstration is denied by the inherent necessities of the case, we are justified in saying that it is also denied by Divine pur-

pose and wisdom. I have referred to the inferential teaching of Heb. 11 : 2, as requiring faith in the Divine existence and character. The same requirement of man, as a moral agent, is the paramount, as well as the primary requirement of God in Holy Scripture, as it is the mainspring of all obedience.

There are further considerations. The measure and degree of God's revelations of Himself to man have, at all times, been so regulated as to require faith, and also to exclude mechanical certitude. It is true to fact that, while miracles, in themselves considered, cannot compel belief, they are yet a cogent reason to justify a reasonable faith ; and they go to make man in a greater degree responsible for disobedience to evidence. Yet our Lord intimates in Matt. 11 : 20–24, that, in certain cases, such kind and degree of evidence, if exhibited, would have amounted to moral compulsion, and that such a measure of evidence it is God's purpose to withhold. It is also a fact that, notwithstanding progressive developments of truth in Holy Scripture, yet, the inscrutability of God, as an element of His being, and of His moral government, as He is the infinite and the eternal One, remains intact.

It is fitting, first, to present the negative argument against evolution, and to draw attention to the fact that anti-theists require from theists a demonstration, which they themselves are not able to give for their philosophical speculations ; while upon them lies the onus probandi.

To the foregoing I will add the five fatal objections to evolution, as the absolute law of the Cosmos, and as stated by Sir Wm. Dawson in his "Origin of the World."

(1) Albuminous, or protoplasmic material seems necessary to the existence of every living being; it is known to us, as a product, only, of the action of previously living protoplasm. The origin of protoplasm is a mystery to science.

(2) No mode is known to us whereby life can be communicated to dead protoplasm.

(3) Species are, to science, unchangeable units, the origin of which we have no means of tracing.

(4) There is radical difference between animal life in general, and that of individual in relation to the embryo. Animal life in general bears a resemblance to the development of the individual from the embryo, yet the external conditions and detail of the two series are different; so of their origin.

(5) Groups of animals in geological time always end without link or connection with previous beings.

Evolution and the Bible Doctrine of Creation

I will, also, here put in contrast the Bible doctrine of creation with the hypothesis of evolution, and the statement of the higher critics as to the origin of the world. Upon the hypothesis aforesaid the world was produced by an evolutionary process, and, by the same law, man came into existence

therein, as a developed animal. Upon the same hypothesis, monotheism is required to be a development from polytheism. To all these different propositions are the higher critics committed by their acceptance of evolution as the governing law of this earth, and of all appertaining to it.

But "Lux Mundi" does not so absolutely and explicitly accept evolution, as to reject the personality of God, and the claims of the New Testament, but they wish to assert that God created, or rather brought the cosmos into being, by, or through the law of evolution; that by the same law, He produced man upon the earth, and by the same law, He redeemed him, or rather put him in the way of redeeming himself. In the first place, I will observe that, while the evolutionary hypothesis requires all this, in conformity to this law, they are obliged (1) to deny creation as an act of God's transcendent personality, (2) they are obliged to deny Bible chronology and its statement as to the antiquity of man, (3) they are obliged, not only to make polytheism the primitive religion of man, and to debase him as to his origin and ontological qualities and personality, involving, as it does, his moral agency, but, in rejecting the first ten chapters of Genesis, they reject the Bible doctrine of sin, its origin, character and consequences, as taught in both the Old and New Testaments; as the whole of Bible teaching, both as to doctrine and practice, is based on this initial truth, and historic fact, as to its en-

trance into the world; but, (4) they are required to deny the plain and explicit teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ, as to the Old Testament and the Mosaic law, as, also, to deny, as they do, the doctrine of atonement and sacrifice, as taught therein, and the plain and emphatic utterances of our Lord concerning Himself as related thereto. All this, I would observe, is involved in the theodicy of Lux Mundi, and there is, logically, no alternative for them, in denying the historical character of the first ten chapters of Genesis, but to deny the whole of the Old and New Testaments, and the claims of our Lord Jesus Christ, as Messiah and Saviour.

It would appear that, as they would make the Law of Moses to be of a date subsequent to the prophetical books, so also do they aver that Jewish tradition, at the first, regarded Jehovah only as a local deity, and did not ascribe to Him creation and eternity of being. This falsification of Jewish tradition and denial of the testimony of Josephus and Philo Judeas is rejected by Prof. Herman Gunkel of the University of Berlin, in a commentary on Genesis, lately issued. He affirms that there is the greatest possible contrast between the traditions of other nations concerning their gods and the traditions of Israel in regard to Jehovah. But we build upon the sure and certain evidence of the engrafted Word, itself, and all through the Old and New Testaments we find explicit or implicit statements of the fact of God as Creator and Sustainer of the

world, or of incidental references thereto, as to axiomatic truths; and, as I have before said, the whole of the Old and New Testaments is based upon God's creative act, as the superstructure is based upon the foundation. I might quote many passages in proof, but it is unnecessary. The statements of our Lord Jesus Christ, in this connection are, as evidence, amply sufficient to refer to.

NOTE D

Of Faith in God

This initiatory and fundamental truth, the basis alike of all sound theism and sound theology, is very ably and satisfactorily set forth by Dr. Thos. Goodwin in his "Object and acts of justifying faith." Dr. Goodwin grounds his arguments, negatively, on the nature of God's being, and, positively, on the declaration of that being, character and will of God, as solemnly proclaimed by God Himself in the thirty-eighth chapter of Exodus. He shews that such declaration of the nature and necessary being of God fed the faith of the saints of the Old Testament, and that in subsequent ages to that in which such declaration was made, it permeated and pervaded the utterances of the sacred writers of the Old Testament, as cumulative testimony to God's character and will; and that the being and personality of God, as revealed, and

specially by His name Jehovah, is the primary object held forth in the Old Testament as the object to which man's faith, as a creature and a sinner, is due.[1] It has by some been affirmed that

[1] It is remarkable that in Elihu's appeal to Job (chapters 33 to 35) he does so by means of God's implicit attributes; the attributes of His nature, or being, and it is yet more remarkable that when God "answered Job out of the whirlwind," in grand and majestic language, He employed the same line of evidence (chapters 39 and 40). It is to be considered that herein there is a direct reference to the necessary being and personality of God, as distinguished from His moral attributes, and perfections. That God's perfect being, as the self-existent One, is evidenced in His works, as appealed to both by Elihu and by Jehovah Himself, is not matter for argument, and, if God is admittedly so declared in His implicit attributes, such declaration must include all the attributes of His personality; that is to say, both His implicit and explicit attributes, as elements of His unique personality, as Cause and as Perfection. Further, if but one of God's moral attributes is made manifest in and by His works, as, for instance, His perfect and unalterable justice and unbending equity, this moral attribute, as manifested, carries with such manifestations every other moral and explicit, and also every natural or implicit attribute of His personality, for God's moral perfections are inseparable from, if not identified with, each other and are one in Him, or they would not, any of them, be the attributes of an all-perfect being; for both as Cause and as Perfection, He is one and the same. But, passing from the inherent and necessary evidence of His works, and His attributes as, so, manifested to the teaching of the Old Testament Scriptures. In the assertion of the claims of God's personality we find that there is a concurrence of evidence; the argument is one and the same. In the quotations I have made it will be observed that the written law corroborates that which is unwritten and consolidates it. It declares that God's attributes are displayed and His personality asserted and declared in His works. This testimony, so corroborated, is constant and continuous; specially, we may say, does it permeate and pervade the Old Testament Scriptures. It is the emphatic assertion of His glorious personality; not alone of His Eternity and Truth, but also of His abundant goodness and specially of His spiritual blessings and His everlasting salvation, as the out-

the mere fact of mercy being a part of the Divine nature is not sufficient to assure man, as a sinner, that such mercy will be exercised on his behalf, and that a special and recorded volition of the Most High is necessary and essential. Dr. Goodwin meets this objection specifically. I will quote his reply thereto upon pages fifty and fifty-one of the before mentioned volume. "But, you will say, though there is an ability to succor, and out of strength to shew mercy, yet, where is the affection of mercy and whence arises that? Ans.—The seat of mercy is in the will, as appears by that speech 'I will be merciful to whom I will be merciful' (Ex. 33: 19). Now the will of God hath affections in it, for there is a hatred of sin, which is an affection of the will that is natural. Though these

come of His Divine mercy to usward. "See now that I kill and I make alive; I wound and I heal, and there is none that can deliver out of my hand; I will work and who shall let it" (Is. 43: 12, 13; so also 45: 21, 22), "Tell ye, and bring them near; yea, let them take counsel together; who hath declared this from ancient time? Have not I, the Lord? and there is no god else beside Me; a just God and a Saviour; there is none beside Me; Look unto Me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth, for I am God and there is none else."

In both cases the appeal is to His personality. It is the same doctrine identically as that set forth by our Lord Jesus Christ, Himself, when He says, "Come unto Me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." The types of the law, and the various figures of the Old Testament reiterate the same truth, and convey the same teaching as the gospel message of the New Testament, "Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world," and the figure of the brazen serpent in the wilderness, as explained by our Saviour, is a declaration of the unity of God, and the unity of the Old and New Testaments.

affections in God are but various postures of His will to various objects, what then is mercy in His will? *Not a mere act, but a propensity*, an inward inclination, from out of His goodness of will to shew mercy to them that are in misery (Ps. 96: 5). He is ready to forgive. 'The Lord is ready to forgive and plenteous in mercy to all them that call upon Him.' There are not metaphors (as bowels and the like, used of mercy) (Ps. 34: 18), but 'The Lord is nigh unto them that are of a broken heart.' Nor in respect of omnipotence, merely, so He is to all; but in readiness of disposition and inclination, He is ready and quick to be merciful as soon as He sees their hearts. If any say that God willeth mercy, and it is His will to shew mercy, let them add and acknowledge that there is a propenseness in His will thereunto, unto such merciful acts, and then they must say, too, that mercy (as to the affection of it) is properly in God."

The argument of Dr. Goodwin in this place, and more fully afterwards, is valid argument and absolute in character. He makes a statement on page ten, chapter two, which qualifies what he afterwards argues, both from God's nature itself (as here), and also from His proclamation of His Name in Ex. 34; by reference to the case of the devils, that a declaration, as an act of His will, were necessary to usward, in order to our mercy and forgiveness. So also Dr. Owen on Forgiveness (p. 418). Also,

"Person and Glory of Christ" (p. 124).[1] To this I answer, God is inherently and necessarily merciful *to the proper subjects of His mercy*, and as He is a perfect Being, and a perfect Moral Governor, the

[1] That God is, in His necessary character and being, merciful to the *proper subjects of His mercy*, is a fact established by accessory evidence upon a cognate subject. As of the Divine character as necessarily and essentially merciful, so, of the fruits, or the effects of such a merciful character.

"There is *forgiveness* with Thee, therefore Thou shalt be feared." The word in the Hebrew *seliyah*, is in the prayer book version, translated by the word mercy (probably from the Septuagint); as an equivalent for, and synonym of "mercy," or *eleos*. A parallel passage may here be quoted, "For Thou Lord art good, and *ready to forgive* and of great mercy to all them that call upon Thee" (Ps. 86: 5). The word here used is *salach*, forgiving, or as in the authorized version—"*ready* to forgive," for which the word *eleos*, (in the Greek) is a true equivalent. Notice also, that the word *Tov*, "good" is a synonomous term, and has the same reference.

And, moreover, "Rich in mercy to all that call upon Thee."

This verse, in its entirety, we may regard as a full delineation of the nature, or being of God.

It may be summarized by saying that He is, in His being, necessarily, and essentially, *merciful*, as He is ready to forgive, or forgiving; but, we are very distinctly told, in many places that such forgiveness is only obtained under *given conditions*. "*If* we *confess* our sins, *He* is *faithful* and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness" (1 John 1: 9).

In other words,—under the Divinely given, and *necessary conditions* annexed thereto, *He* will,—certainly,—be true to His character. To this it may be added, as a cognate truth, of those whom God has, by His Holy Spirit regenerated, and made, in measure, to partake of His mind, that they are, *so*, made merciful and forgiving in character.

St. James tells us, in his general Epistle (ch. 1: 9), that "The wisdom that is from above is, first, pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated; full of mercy and good fruits." *This* character is to be put in *contrast* with that of the unregenerate, who are declared of God, and are evidenced as such before men, as "implacable,

devils are not proper subjects of His mercy, as their sin was against such a full degree of knowledge of God as made it presumption and irremissible. So, and for this reason, they have, by a presumptuous act, and by abuse of their free agency, identified themselves with sin, and cast off their rightful allegiance to God, and by a moral inability as the result of their own act, they cannot repent. This inability binds all of their moral nature, they will not and they do not desire to repent. Theirs is a rooted enmity and antagonism to God, and to His Holy law. Not so of the sin of man, collectively, and generically considered, as in Adam. I mean there is not that degree of inherent moral inability, although there be need of a Divine act of regeneration. The individual sinner, under Moses' law, who sinned presumptuously against that law, for him such law made no provision for atonement and forgiveness. Therefore, the declaration in Ex. 34; as setting forth both what is inherent in God's nature, and so solemnly ratifying the fact of His inherently merciful nature as "good and ready to forgive" (Ps. 86: 5) holds absolutely and without qualification, as in God, and in and by His holy

unmerciful" (Rom. 1: 31). Further than this: Our Lord's words to His disciples, while inculcating mercy upon them as a necessary and distinctive feature, do so, on defined and specified *conditions.*

"If thy brother trespass against thee, rebuke him; and, if *he repent*, forgive him. And if he trespass against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day *turn again to thee*, saying, I repent, thou shalt forgive him" (Luke 17: 3, 4).

moral law, to all who are, properly, and actually subjects of His mercy, *i. e.*, to those who will and who do repent. I will add to this what I have elsewhere said as to the unity of all God's attributes (implicit and explicit) in His personality, and, therefore, the action of all those attributes is a reciprocal action, the action of one is the action of all. The implicit declaration, to us of His disposition to, and of His purposes of mercy, as such perfect good, as He stands related to us, His creatures, under such conditions (also in His nature) as makes us proper subjects of His mercy. As we owe it to God, as the necessary and perfect good, so revealed to us, to believe in His nature, as such perfect good, so do we owe it to Him, as the good, and as so revealed, to believe that His purpose to us and His mind and will towards us, as creatures, and as sinners, are purposes and dispositions of perfect goodness, perfect truth and perfect faithfulness, as we, so, put our whole trust in Him; and such deduction from the being of God is justified and confirmed by the explicit utterances of His word, and by His promises of mercy to such, as well as such result is secured by the validity of the premises of His necessary being and character.

There is much in the Holy Scriptures, both of the Old and of the New Testaments, to fortify, and also to reassert and amplify the solemn declaration, specifically made by Jehovah Himself in Ex. 34: 5–18. We find it asserted, and reasserted in the Old

Testament, on many occasions, from different points of view; in fact it may be said to be continuously asserted; either explicitly or implicitly. I will give but two, or three instances. It is an oft-repeated utterance,—perhaps, specially in the Psalms, and in some places made specially emphatic, that "His mercy endureth forever."

In Psalm 136, the Psalmist first makes this application, absolutely, and specifically, to the nature, and being of God; to His Personality as Jehovah; he then applies it to His works in Creation, as well as to His implicit attributes; he then proceeds to apply it to the history of His Providence and care over the Israelites as a people from the time of the Exodus until their possession of the land of Canaan, as promised to Abraham. Perhaps the great truth so iterated and reiterated, that "His mercy endureth forever," as solemnly stated in each particular instance, is not clearly apprehended, and at once realized. Is it not *this:* His mercy is as certain, as constant, as unchangeable *as is His own Being?* It is thus set forth that *all men* may know, apprehend, and *rely most surely upon it*, that our God is a God of necessary, unchangeable, and eternal mercy: it is identified with His Name,—that endureth forever. "Thy Name *O Jehovah*, endureth forever" (Ps. 135: 13).

In this attribute of His character He is not only fully to be *depended upon*, but, in *this*, emphatically, He has a *special delight.* We are told, for in-

stance, that "The Lord's delight is in them that fear Him, and in those that hope in His mercy" (Ps. 147: 11; also Micah 7: 18), "Because He delighteth in *mercy*."

In so doing they do but truly apprehend and confess His real character, and give Him the glory that is due unto His Name. To these instances quoted, I will add but one more reference to a fundamental and primary truth of the greatest importance and necessity, as setting forth the character and being of God.

In Psalm 89: 1, 2, David says: "I will sing of the mercies of the Lord forever: with my mouth I will make known Thy faithfulness to all generations. For I have said, Mercy shall be built up forever: Thy faithfulness shalt Thou establish in the very Heavens," *i. e.*, *this* truth as an eternal truth: Our God is a God of eternal, excellent and unfailing mercy; Mercy, as declared and offered, freely, *to all people;* Mercy, and Truth, specially towards His servants, as they are related to Him by faith and obedience, and as they are, thus, heirs of His Covenant, and peculiar promises.

There is yet further, accessory, and inferential evidence that the Personality of God, inherently considered, is the proper, primary, and Divinely appointed object of human trust; of man's *absolute* trust, as a man and as a sinner. We have already seen that God has annexed a specific blessing to trust in "His Name," and in Himself;

these are synonymous terms, or parallel expressions.

He may, then, ask *for what* does man *need to*, and for what *should he* trust in God? In *general* terms we may say, As He is the absolute source and centre of all good, in Himself, and to *him*, as a creature, and as he is a sinner; but more particularly, and specially, as he is a *sinner*. And what special and peculiar good does man need from God, as such; as he is a *sinner?*

We may comprise it all in two words, Mercy, and Truth; and Truth as it stands related to, and is security,—specially,—for Mercy!

The *result*, inferentially considered, is the same as the dogmatic and specific evidence and requirement, *i. e.*, it is *due* to God, as an inherent and necessary element of His Personality, that man should trust in Him, as He is the *Perfection* of *Mercy*.

With regard to faith in God, as revealed in creation and providence, it is asserted, by some, that these evidences are inadequate revelations to us, of His being and character, that they do but represent and declare some of the elements of that being, *i. e.*, His power, His wisdom and His holiness, but not His love and mercy, and, so, do not give that knowledge of God which is necessary to salvation. These statements commonly have been made with a view to magnify Holy Scripture, but they are neither justifiable nor true. In the first place, be it considered that God's attributes are inseparable

from each other, and are inherent not only in His personality, but in all His acts and operations. I do not now dwell upon the inference deducible from such a proposition, counter to God's necessary perfections in, so, withholding from a large, and in fact, the larger portion of mankind, that knowledge which is necessary to their fulfilment of the duty which they owe to Him. It would follow from their premises that nature does not at all reveal God, *i. e.*, a perfect personality, for such, alone, is the God of nature, or the God of the Bible.

I have before shown that God is known by His works, and that this truth is corroborated, and confirmed by the plain and distinct teaching of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. It is sufficient now to notice that, in such teaching, our Lord affirms that goodness and mercy of God to be declared in the fact that He causes the sun to arise on the evil and on the good, and that He sends rain on the just and on the unjust.

I purpose, now, to establish the proposition that the personality of God the Father, as Creator and moral governor, is propounded to us in Holy Scripture as the primary and essential object of our faith, in all the evidence of Him so set forth to us. This proposition I conceive to have a very important relation to fundamental principles of theism. I shall but epitomize what I regard as the teaching of Holy Scripture on this point.

The fact that God's works of creation and provi-

dence do, in themselves, as addressed to man, comprehend and contain evidence of His existence and character, constitute a fundamental, natural and necessary requirement, from man, of faith in Him and of obedience to Him. This requirement of natural law is reasserted and confirmed, implicitly, and explicitly, by the teaching of Holy Scripture, as the complementum of evidence. The grounds of our faith in God are, both in creation and in Holy Scripture, presented as twofold, *i. e.*, God as First-Cause, and God as perfection. These have respect to God (1) as Creator, and (2) as Moral Governor, but both these aspects of God stand related to His personality, and to His implicit or natural, and to His explicit or moral attributes of character. This conception of the personality of God includes all His attributes, as First-Cause, and as perfection, and not solely His power, holiness and wisdom. Whether we view Him as Creator, or as Moral Governor, God's personality stands related to us as chief and perfect good. The attributes of God's personality are reciprocally operative, in both relations, that is to say, that His unity—the unity of His personality as Cause and as perfection —is found in the attributes of that personality. To "know God," and to believe in Him, are, in Holy Scripture, synonymous terms; so, also to obey and to love Him. Such knowledge or belief of God is a belief in Him as the perfection of good. "There is none good but One, that is God" (Matt.

19 : 17), *i. e.*, the perfect personality. This includes both His natural and His moral attributes, or, perfect being and perfect character. It is of peculiar importance to define what is the relation that the person of Christ, as the object of our faith, has to the personality of God, as the primary object of faith set forth to us in Holy Scripture.[1] Our

[1] I select a passage from a precious little Treatise, written many years ago, to introduce here. As will be seen, it is but a selection from *more* to the same effect. "And the Father and the Son have more specially appropriated to them, the promising the good things which the Holy Ghost reveals and works: because in free grace, a purpose and promise must go before the revelation and exhibition of them; as the Father's Person, and the Son's, are in order of subsistence, though not in time, before the person of the Holy Ghost; therefore I say, promising is more specially appropriated in Scripture to the Father and to the Son. And, as promising on their parts, so believing on our part, is more specially appropriated in Scripture to them too: to the Father, because the promises are but expressions, and obligations of Himself, to perform His promises. Inasmuch therefore as He who is the first person of the three, assumes to Himself the purposing or decreeing of them all which is the first root and rise of everything; there is a fitness that He also should assume to himself the promising of them; inasmuch as they are the issue and offspring of His own good-will. And the Son being heir to all His Father's, is also heir to His purposes, and promises; and had them all made over to Him (as ye heard before), and was appointed to purchase them for us; and so they, also, are His own; and He, with the Father appropriate more specially to themselves our believing in them, unto the performance of the promises. And the Father, though He made over all promises to the Son, and appointed Him also to purchase them! Yet He put not Himself out of possession, though he put His Son also in with Himself, and gave His Son another proper title by purchase; yet the Father kept His own title to the promises, and so too our believing in Him as well as the Son; which is intimated in this, that He retains in His own Hands that promise of making Christ's enemies His foolstool (Ps. 110 : 1), which contains in it also, the consummation of all promises

Lord comes to us as the human, or earthly representation of God the Father, "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God, in the face of Jesus Christ" (2 Cor. 4 : 6), "The only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him" (John 1 : 18), or "in His person, He hath made Him known or represented Him"—(ἐξηγέομαι—to declare in person). He is so represented to us both in the Old and New Testaments, and by our Lord Himself. In one respect, alone, is He inferior to the Father, *i. e.*, as He is the Incarnate God,—so, "My Father is greater than I" (John 14 : 28). It is only so that these words of our Lord can be justly interpreted. We gather from the teaching of our Lord, also, that union with the Father is essential to union with the Son, and vice versa. "I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in One" (John 17 : 23). So (John 17 : 9, 10), "I will that those whom Thou hast given Me be with Me where I am," and (John 6 : 65), "No man can come to Me, except it were given to him of My Father." It is to be considered that Christ, as Saviour, is the gift of the Father. "Thanks be unto God for His un-

of believers, both of justification and sanctification and resurrection from death (1 Cor. 15 : 25, 26), which God the Father assumes to Himself, though He executes and performs it by Christ (as ye heard before), therefore Christ Himself (though He is at God's right Hand) trusts in God (Heb. 10 : 12, 13) and so must all believers."

"Comfort for Believers about their Sin and Troubles," by John Archer, sometime preacher at All Hallows, Lombard St., London.

Printed first for John Marshall at the Bible, Grace Church Street, 1705. Reprinted by W. Day, 17 Goswell St., 1822.

speakable gift" (2 Cor. 9 : 15). So,—He is the full declaration of God's character and of His love to man. Belief in Christ is inseparable from belief in God (1 John 2 : 23, 24). To deny the Son is to deny the Father. "By Him ye do believe in God, who raised Him up from the dead and gave Him glory that your faith and hope might be in God" (1 Peter 1 : 21). So also John 6 : 44, 45. A belief in God's necessary character and attributes generally, and specially as a merciful God, both includes and anticipates His revealed way of mercy. Here, be it noticed that He did, to Moses, make a solemn and specific declaration of His character and attributes, in which declaration, mercy and forgiveness was a conspicuous element (Ex. 34 : 18). The same truth is involved in the declaration of our Lord that supreme love of God, and the love of our neighbor as ourselves, is "all the law and the prophets." Thus, the scope of God's Holy Word, in the Old and in the New Testaments, sets forth the fact that the requirement of faith in God, as First-Cause and Supreme Good, is a primary requirement, and that such faith in Him is a faith unto salvation.

"Have faith in God," *i. e.*, absolute faith (Mark 11 : 22). "Ye believe in God, believe also in Me" (John 14 : 1), *i. e.*, with absolute belief. The prophecies of Christ, in Holy Scripture, in common with all other promises of future good, are to be regarded as promises of God the Father; and, not

only every promise of Christ,—as to come,—but also of the Holy Ghost; and the disciples of Christ were directed of Him to wait at Jerusalem for the promise of the Father, "which, saith He, ye have heard of Me" (Acts 1 : 4). The promises of God, in every case, emanate from His Divine personality as Father of His creatures, and so require faith in that personality, as the perfect good. Throughout the Old Testament, entire, and absolute faith, and hope in God, as chief good, is everywhere inculcated, and by God's saints expressed. "The hope of all the ends of the earth" (Ps. 65 : 5). "Nevertheless my soul wait thou still upon God, for my hope is in Him" (Ps. 62 : 5). "I will hope in Thy name, for it is good before Thy saints" (Ps. 52 : 9; 33 : 18–22; 31 : 24).[1] It is a distinctive characteristic of God's saints, as it ever has been, that they do, so, "set their hope on God," and ground all their expectation upon Him; and God has, for this reason, made to them special promises. "Because he hath set his love upon Me, therefore will I deliver him; I will set him up, because he hath known

[1] We find frequent references, in Holy Scripture, to the "Name of the Lord," as an object of trust. By this we are to understand His nature, being and personality, as the alone and all-sufficient ground of human dependence. Everything, for man is here contained. We are taught to expect everything from God, to wait for and to rest upon Him. His nature and being is, for us, the well-spring of good. I will make but one quotation. "Who is he among you that feareth the Lord, that obeyeth the voice of His servant, that walketh in darkness, and that hath no light? Let him trust in the name of the Lord and stay upon his God" (Is. 50 : 10).

My Name" (Ps. 91 : 14). Moreover, such is the discipline and teaching through which they each and all, now and in all ages, do pass and have passed at His hands, that it is designed of God to develop and to perfect that trust in Him and that choice of Him that He has created by His Holy Spirit. "They that know Thy Name will put their trust in Thee, for Thou Lord hast not forsaken them that seek Thee." So also we find that a specific blessing is declared by the prophet (Jer. 17 : 5–8) upon those who trust in Jehovah, while a specific curse is pronounced upon those who "trust in man, and whose heart has departed from the Lord." Our Lord bases His claim to man's belief upon Him (*a*), on God's testimony to His personality, and upon the fact that He was sent of Him, and (*b*) upon His miraculous works, corroborating that testimony to His personality." "This is the work of God, that ye believe on Him whom He hath sent" (John 5 : 38 and John 6 : 17 *ad finem*), "Whom He hath sent, Him ye believe not." Christ, as Saviour,—His propitiatory sacrifice, is in the New Testament set forth as "God's righteousness," even as Christ is set forth as "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." That is to say, the Lamb ordained and appointed of God. So, also, is it said that "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself" (2 Cor. 5 : 18, 19).

Our Lord officially declared it to be the will of the Father, "that whosoever seeth the Son, and

believeth on Him may have eternal life" (John 6 : 38, 40). Our Lord Jesus Christ, as Saviour, and as the ultimate messenger of the Father, has distinctly ratified the doctrine of the Old Testament concerning God as the Father, and the Supreme Good of His creatures, and as the primary object of faith.

Wherefore,—until the Incarnation of Christ and His manifestation as Saviour of men, the object of faith set before us in Holy Scripture is the person of God the Father, as Cause, and as Perfection, and as the Father of mankind ; and Holy Scripture does not justify the statement that all saving faith antecedent to the coming of Christ has been faith specifically upon the person of Christ, as promised of God.

It is sufficient to say that a restriction of salvation to faith in the person of Christ, as necessary to salvation "at all times since the entrance of sin," would consign all nations without the Scriptures to the penalty of eternal death, and, at the same time, deny the possibility of God being known, loved and obeyed under natural evidences.

In regard to all such inferences I will again say that, as erroneous in their character, and without sanction by Holy Scripture in the Old or New Testament, or by our Lord Himself, such a representation of revealed religion, or rather a misrepresentation thereof, has been at least the stimulating cause of the wide spread unbelief of Holy Scripture which

we witness and deplore at the present day, as coupled with a reaction against fundamental and elementary theism.

Summary

(1) Intrinsically, and in itself considered, the fact of God's personality, as Cause and as Perfection, and His relation to men as Father of His creatures, comprehends and contains, for them, provision of and security for every good.

(2) The works of God in creation and in His providence and care, do, in themselves, as addressed to man, contain and present to him adequate evidence of the existence and character of God.

(3) The objective evidence, so presented to man, constitutes the minimum of theistic evidences, as ordained of God.

(4) God's Holy Word, throughout, corroborates and confirms, as it amplifies such evidence of God's personality, as set forth by natural law, and it inculcates as truth vital to man, the apprehension and acceptance of God as First-Cause, and as Supreme Good.

(5) Desire for, and a sense of absolute need of God, as chief good, has characterized and does characterize all God's saints.

(6) A faith of the operation of God, having for its object God's personality, embraces as it realizes the fact of His fulness and sufficiency.

(7) God's revelation of Himself as a God of

mercy and as chief good, finds its complementum in the person and offices and in the atoning work of His Son, Jesus Christ, and as such He is set forth to us in the New Testament, as the proper and specific object of our faith, as necessary to a true faith in God,—and so, as faith unto salvation. (John 5:17–31), "He that honoreth not the Son, honoreth not the Father which hath sent Him."

(8) Our Lord and Saviour, as the ultimate messenger of the Father, has corroborated and confirmed the general evidence of the Old Testament Scriptures concerning the personality of God, as containing for man the fulness of good. "And this is life eternal, that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent" (John 17:3).

CHAPTER II

NOTE A

Natural Religion as a subjective result of objective evidences, and representing (1) duty to God, as taught, and (2) duty to God, as done under Natural Law.

The force and value of natural evidences for God are frequently disparaged, specially by rationalistic writers. Also, natural religion is sometimes depreciated in order to exalt the Word of God, and as a reason for its propagation, as well as an incentive to missionary effort.

The bearing of this subject upon heathen ignorance, upon apologetics and also upon the missionary work of the church, I have made a separate consideration. Natural religion, as the subjective effect of belief of objective evidences for theism, may be regarded in two chief and distinct aspects. The first consists in duty taught, (*a*) duty to God, (*b*) duty to man. The first aspect of natural religion includes also the argument by which such duty is substantiated, and proved as obligatory. The first and chief argument to which I have before referred is a direct argument in the form of moral axioms clearly deducible from the objective evidences of God's works

in creation; as such evidence is presented to a self-conscious and free moral agent. Man's ontological and moral faculties are a chief element and factor in such evidence. The second argument is an accessory and subordinate one, as it is an analogical and inferential argument from marks of design in nature, as requiring a designer, and a moral lawgiver. This latter argument is used by Bishop Butler, and applied to the doctrine of a future life and future rewards and punishments; also by Dr. Wayland, in his "Elements of Moral Science," but chiefly with reference to God's moral government in this life. It is also used by Archdeacon Paley in his evidences of Christianity.

A second aspect of natural religion is that of duty done or refused, *i. e.*, the concrete, as related to the abstract, or the action of the individual, and the moral agent upon the objective evidence of duty presented. St. Paul refers to this aspect of natural religion in Rom. 2:12, speaking of those who have "sinned without law," and also of those who, "having not the law, are a law unto themselves," and, where it is regarded as an axiomatic fact that there is an "uncircumcision which has kept the righteousness of the law," and this is cited by the apostle as an actual fact of duty to God, known, accepted and performed by the light of natural religion. Its effectual operation is there set forth at large. Our Lord's teaching in Luke 12:54–58 is to the same effect. A large number of instances might be set

forth from Old Testament Scripture; it will suffice to notice some of them. I will first notice what is said of Cain. "Why art thou wroth, and why is thy countenance fallen? If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door. And, to thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him." In this instance we trace a distinct appeal, and that from God Himself, to what Hooker calls the "grand mandates," or chief axioms of duty to God and duty to men, *i. e.*, to the law of love, and to the moral law of obedience thereto, or, in other words, to the universal principle of natural religion. The love which Cain owed to his brother was Right, or Well; the law eternal, peculiar to man, as under law to God. The breach of it would be to him, sin, and sin, as chosen and duty refused, would surely entail condign punishment. The last sentence, "To thee shall be his desire" was a further appeal to him to "do well," with promise of corresponding results. Under such circumstances, the younger would look up to, and be led by the elder. The judgment following upon Cain's sin is further illustration of the law of natural religion, and of God's moral government thereby. The case of Abimelech, King of Gerar, as given in Gen. 20 is of a peculiar force in illustration of the principle. God's words to Abimelech shew that he was a worshipper of Him, in fellowship with Him, and that it was a fact recognized by God, Himself. Abimelech's

words, "In the integrity of my heart and in the innocency of my hands, I have done this," were owned and accepted of God. The chapter throughout is replete with evidence. The Book of Job is characterized by such evidence, as everywhere accepted and axiomatic. A brief epitome will manifest this. In Job 4:7, 8 Eliphas refers to the character of God's moral government as to a fact well known. "Remember I pray thee, who ever perished, being innocent, and where were the righteous cut off?" In chapter 5:6, 7 Eliphas says that trouble is governed by law,—and so by a lawgiver. So, also that "He taketh the wise in their own craftiness" (quoted by St. Paul in 1 Cor. 3:19). In chapter 8:11–13, Bildad tells of the results of all those "who forget God," and says that the hope of the ungodly, or impious man shall perish. This is illustrated by analogy of the rush withering. Chapter 11:13, 20 refers to God as rewarding those who seek Him. Chapter 17 declares that "the righteous shall hold on his way, and he that hath clean hands shall become stronger and stronger." In chapter 27:8 occurs a remarkable passage, remarkable because of what I shall now refer to. The passage reads as follows,—"What is the hope of the impious (or wicked) man (Yānēph), though he hath spoiled (or gotten unlawful gain) from Bātsā to tear in pieces (or plunder) when God draweth out (or withdraweth) his soul?" (From Shālā to draw out.) There is great reason to believe that our

Lord, when He put the weighty question, "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul, or what shall a man give as a ransom for (ἀντάλλαγμα) his soul?" consciously took this utterance of Job and reproduced it in an intensified form, and with more direct reference to a future life. It may also be considered that, in the parable of the rich fool, when God said unto him, "Thou fool, this night shall thy soul be required of thee (ἀπαιτέω), then whose shall those things be which thou hast provided?" there is not only a parallel signification, but a reference to the former passage quoted. The verb απειτεω, to require back, has precisely the same signification as the Hebrew Shālā before noticed, in connection with the act of God in withdrawing the soul, or, taking back what He had deposited or given. The analogy, here, of the withdrawal of a deposit, is something that would be generally and well understood. There is a reference in verses 16 and 17 of this chapter to the same general subject, and to the providence and moral government of God. "Though he (the unjust) heap up silver as the dust, and prepare raiment as the clay, he may prepare it, but the just shall put it on, and the innocent shall divide the silver." It is also important to notice (what is implied in the book of Job) that God, in His moral government of mankind, by natural religion, is giving object lessons to others of the facts and character of that moral government, in the results that follow,

from a righteous, or from an ungodly life. Also that Job and his friends accepted the fact of God's holy personality, and of His government of the world, physically and morally, by natural law. The address of Elihu has the same axiomatic basis, and it was upon the basis of this generally accepted truth that God, Himself, in speaking to Job summed up the evidence.

In addition to the instances already given may be mentioned the appeal of Solomon to Shimei, who cursed David. After reminding him of the charge he had given him, the oath that he had laid him under, and of the clemency he had shewed him, and of his own consent to the stipulation made by Solomon, saying, "The word that I have heard is good," the king goes on to say, "Why hast thou not kept the oath of the Lord, and the commandment that I have charged thee with?" The king said, moreover, to Shimei, "Thou knowest all the wickedness that thine heart is privy to, that thou didst unto David my father. Therefore, the Lord shall return thy wickedness on thine own head." Thus, by the force and power of moral law, or natural religion in its operation upon the soul, as duty taught, by his own act, but, also under Divine providence, Shimei brought about his own punishment (1 Kings 2: 36–45).

So of Joab in his history, character and punishment (1 Kings 2: 28–35), we have illustration of the same truth; and Solomon's words may be re-

garded as expressive of God's judgment, under natural religion and moral law. In like manner may be regarded David's prophetic utterance upon the occasion of the death of Abner, at the hand of Joab. "The Lord shall reward the doer of evil, according to his wickedness." St. Paul, in shewing the comparative power of prophecy, as related to the gift of tongues, says, "If all prophesy and there come in one that believeth not, or one unlearned, he is convinced of all, he is judge of all, and thus are the secrets of his heart made manifest, and, so, falling down on his face will worship God and confess that God is with you of a truth" (1 Cor. 14).

It is also to be noticed that, here, we not only have a statement of fact, by St. Paul, through the Holy Ghost, but also of a truth accepted by the Corinthian Christians, as axiomatic, and, so, addressed to all those who acknowledge the law of natural religion. It is further to be remarked that in all these instances we are directed to the consideration of the relation of objective evidences for God (or natural theology), to the subjective operation of the ontological or moral faculties of man, to whom that evidence is presented and addressed, as to a moral and a responsible agent, and terminating upon his moral nature, for good, or for evil under the law of conscience, and free agency, as these faculties are reciprocally related to the other moral qualities of the soul.

Further consideration, in this connection, will

arise when we proceed to the particular examination of the functions of conscience, as it is related to free agency.

Note B

Ontological Argument

There is a positive and specific argument for elementary theism that arises from the distinctive, ontological qualities of man as the special handiwork of God. I shall not attempt to do more than quote some passages embodying the facts of the physiological evidence, as ascertained by competent specialists in that department.

Prof. Richard Owen in his lecture on the Anthropoid Apes, delivered before the Ethnological section of the British Scientific Association, an abstract of which appeared in London Athanæm for 1854, says, "It is not without interest to observe that as the general forms of the Quadramana approach the bimonous order, they are represented by fewer species. The Gibbos (Hylobates) scarcely number more than half a dozen species, or at most three. The Chimpanzees (Troglodytes) are represented by two species. The unity of the human species is demonstrated by the constancy of those osteological and dental characters to which the attention is more particularly directed in the investigation of the corresponding character of the higher quadra-

mana. Man is the sole species of his genus, the sole representative of his order. Professor Muller of Berlin says, "From a physiological point of view we may speak of varieties of men; no longer of races. Man is a species created once, and divided into none of its varieties by specific distinction." The Dean of Norwich, Dr. Lefroy, at the meeting of the British and Foreign Bible Society (1895), quotes an admission from Fiske, which he styles as remarkable. He says, "No fact in nature is fraught with deeper meaning than the two-sided fact of the extreme physical similarity, and the enormous physical divergence between man and the group of animals next to him in the history of organic life." All these authorities are in harmony with what is stated by Sir Wm. Dawson, in enumerating the great scientific objections to evolution, and which I have given elsewhere. With these statements, we may couple the language of God's Holy Word, as to the creation of man. "Surely your blood of your lives will I require; at the hands of every beast will I require it, and at the hand of man; at the hand of every man's brother will I require the life of man. Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God made He man." The image of God here spoken of is that which is referred to in the account of His creations (Gen. 2 : 7). It refers, evidently, to his ontological and distinctive character and capacities, as created of God. We are to connect

what is referred to, in the latter passage, with the passage in chapter 9. In describing God's creative act, it is said, "He breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." Also what is said in the eighth Psalm, "Thou madest him a little lower than the angels, and crowned him with glory and honor. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of Thy hands; Thou hast put all things under his feet."

There can be no doubt that the immediate reference here is to man generically considered, in his relation to the animal creation. So, also, the statement that he is "a little lower than the angels," because he is endowed with a reasonable soul and with moral and religious capacities. As Hooker says, "God gave in creation a law to everything, by which it should be governed; He gave to man, as the law of his life, the law of reason. By this law, as connected with moral capacities, and a determinating will, he is radically separated from the animals. In him, reason, moral affection, and the power of choice; as these qualities are correlated to each other, in free agency, the distinctive and specific unity of his nature is manifested and declared. So, as a free agent, and a responsible being, it is declared of him, by God, "I have created him for My glory; I have formed him; Yea I have made him" (Is. 43 : 7).

It is of vital consequence to consider the fact that it is to such a responsible being that the evidence

of God's existence, character and operations is presented. It is upon the sufficiency of the evidence, as related to such moral capacities in those to whom the evidence is addressed, and to the fact of a necessary moral trial and accountability, that the character and cogency of Theistic argument turns, and by which it must, necessarily, be distinguished. As it deals with objective moral truths, whether contained in nature or in supernatural evidence, it must be connected with the fact of the ontological and moral capacities of a responsible agent. As the character of moral truth is, itself, distinctive from scientific or philosophic truth, so of man's ontological qualities. Modern pantheism would invalidate both these distinctions. But, both facts go to exclude certitude, and demonstration, as the result of evidence upon moral questions to a moral agent, and both go to require and necessitate a moral result, in the responsible exercise of those rational and moral qualities upon moral evidence.

The government and trial of a moral agent requires an appeal by adequate evidence to the rational faculty, but it equally requires, and in the same ratio, an appeal to moral affection and the self-determining power of choice as exercised upon objective evidence. Such trial is incompatible with mechanical or merely intellectual certitude and demonstration, as it is incompatible with any form of necessity or compulsion.

The argument for the Divine existence is a moral,

as distinguished from a metaphysical argument, although it is a reasonable one; so, also the argument for a Personal Creator and Moral Governor, as addressed to a moral agent, is of a like character, and the patent and undeniable fact of man's ontological and moral qualities can only be satisfactorily explained by the cognate fact of a Personal and transcendent First Cause (not, "the immanent Reason of the Universe") in whom all those moral qualities exist in perfection, and from whom they are all derived. The only alternative is the assertion of atheism and the irrational and moral impossibility that those faculties in man are underived, and therefore, themselves perfect, or the source of perfection.

The moral government of God is operative to the formation and determination of character under moral law. This can only be done by moral trial, in which every faculty of the moral nature is called into exercise, and not merely the intellectual and critical faculty, but this is the mechanical result of a so called theodicy which would neutralize the spiritual element in objective theism, and in the faculties of man, as it would "fuse" every kind of truth in one, and, actually, absorb religious truth in philosophy and metaphysics.

But the process by which men become members of the Christian Church, and, consequently, or inferentially, character is formed,—according to "Lux Mundi"—is not a moral process of intelligent faith

and moral affections, in obedience to Divine Truth, but by a mechanical process of corporate and sacramental grace.

NOTE C

Negative Argument for Monotheism

It is a necessary sequence from the premises of cosmical evolution, that its advocates hold polytheism to have been the primitive religion of mankind.

The essayists in "Lux Mundi" state this negatively rather than positively. This is not difficult to account for. Over against their hypothesis, and its theodicy, I wish to state the negative argument for monotheism, from archæology and other sources. I think that it has all the force and value so claimed for it. I will but remark that the actual faith of the individual is not, always, correctly defined by the technical and critical definition of the belief or opinions of the creed with which he is classed. There is also, little doubt that many have been and are believers in the one living and true God, who are not so described by the tenets of the society with which they are or have been associated. A variety of causes may and do operate and cooperate, by reason of which the actual facts do not appear in evidence. Hettinger, in his "Natural Religion" has gathered a variety of evidence, from writers who have made a specialty of archæ-

ology, from which book, first, I will make some quotations. "The more I investigate ancient history, the more I am convinced that among civilized nations there existed, at the first, a pure worship of the Supreme Being, that the magic power of nature gradually gave rise to polytheism, and finally wholly obscured the spiritual conception of religion in the popular mind" (Aug. W. Schegel, Preface to translation of Pritchard's Egyptian Mythology, p. 16).

Grimme (Deutsche Mythology) says, "The monotheistic form of religion appears to be the original form, out of which polytheism was subsequently developed."

Max Müller owns the prior existence of monotheism. Von Bohlen maintains the same among the Persians. Lieutenant Maury, writing of the Egyptians ("Des Travaux Modernes sur L'Egypt," Reveu des deu Mondes, 1855) says, "Monotheism is still more manifest in the Shuking of the Chinese, the Hymns of the Rig. Veda, and in the Shuter—one of the most ancient records of Brahminical dogma." There is a monotheism, says Max Muller, which precedes the Polytheism of the Veda, and, even in the invocation of their innumerable gods, the remembrance of a God, One and Infinite, breaks through the midst of an idolatrous phraseology like the blue sky, that is hidden by passing clouds" (A History of Ancient Literature, Ed. 1885, pp. 559–568).

The late Duke of Argyle, "Unity of Nature,"

chapter of The Degradation of Man, says, that in the earliest Vedic literature, Dyans stood for "The Bright Shining One," or "The Living Being, whose dwelling is the light"; corrupted afterwards to mean the sky.

The Aryans, while in their language personifying the heavenly bodies, did not imagine them to possess bodies like ours, but they used this language as most readily apprehended. In the Hymn to the Rising Sun, in the 125th chapter, Book of the Dead, the Deity is addressed as "Maker of Heaven and Earth," and "The Self-Existent One."

The Old Egyptians regarded Him as the God of law and order, living in the Truth. The God of Justice, as the unchangeable Law of Right, in the moral world, and the God of Order, in the physical creation. The same is seen in the theology of the Veda (Renouf, Hibbert Lectures, 1879, pp. 197–9.)

We are told that amongst African tribes, it is a constant saying that, formerly, heaven was nearer to man than it is now; that the Highest Good, the Creator Himself, gave, formerly, lessons of wisdom to human beings, but that, afterwards, He withdrew Himself and dwells now far from them in heaven. All the Indian races have the same tradition.

The idea of "One living and true God, everlasting" appears to be a conception of the human mind deduced from objective nature, and from moral

intuitions present with man, universally, at all periods of the world's history, although in various measures and degrees. Socrates spoke of God as the Supreme Wisdom, and the Supreme Good, revealed in nature. Plato, also, spoke of Him as the Supreme God, and as the Supreme Spirit; as the Absolute and Perfect God; as the Creator. Aristotle said that Good is the Cause of all movement, that He is the fulness of life, and pure spirit, that He is an object worthy of thought in Himself, that He is the Supreme Good, and the Source of Life.

Fechner remarks that "propagation spreads truth and destroys error"; "The grand fable of God and the life to come would never have been so widely established if it had been but a fable." The religion of ancient Egypt is the best known criterion of the religion of primitive man, and brings us nearest to prehistoric times, but the recent archæological discoveries, as the result of excavations at different points, has not only put us in possession of facts in regard to ancient literature wholly unexpected, but may soon revolutionize conclusions on this particular point. We may, at least, assert a negative conclusion against polytheism, from facts in our possession as to ancient Egypt. M. Renouf in his Hibbert Lectures, 1879, says that the maxims of Ptahitets are considered, without doubt, to be the most ancient book in the world. It was written as far back as the fifth dynasty, and refers back to a yet earlier period. These maxims not only incul-

cate a pure morality, but they make distinct reference to the personality of God. They speak of God forbidding and of God commanding. A few quotations will shew that they understood of the existence of a Supreme Personality. "The field which the great God hath given thee to till." "If any one behave himself proudly, he will be humbled by God, who maketh his strength." "Thy treasure has grown unto thee by the gift of God." "The magnanimous man is the object of God's regard, but he who listens to his belly is scorned by his own wife." "If thou art a wise man, bring up thy son in the love of God." "God loveth the obedient and hateth the disobedient."

Such language could only be used of a personality. M. Emmanuel de Rougé has a very high rank as a scholar and Egyptologist. He says, "No one has called in question the fundamental meaning of the passages by the help of which we are able to establish what ancient Egypt has taught concerning God, the world and man. I said God,—not the gods. The first characteristic of the religion is the unity of God, One, Sole and Only; no other with him. He is the only Being, living in Truth. Thou art One, and millions proceed from Thee." "He has made everything and He alone is not made." "The clearest, the simplest, the most precise conceptions." Although the Egyptian religion, under Menes, included many regions, each having its own local deity, designated by a particular name, one

idea predominated in all; that of a simple primeval God, everywhere and always it is one substance, self-existent, and an incomprehensible, unapproachable God." It is the opinion of M. Renouf, and of Max Müller also, that pantheism, and ultimately polytheism, supervened. Yet, notwithstanding this, the ancient and primeval conception was that of a pure monotheism such as the Holy Scriptures reveal.

"Horus and Rā, and Osiris and Set are names of individual and finite powers, but a power without a name, or any mythological character is constantly referred to in the singular number, and can only be regarded as the object of that immediate perception of the Infinite, which, like my learned predecessor Max Müller, I consider not the result of reason, or generalizing, but an intuition as irresistible as the impressions of our senses" (Renouf, Hibbert Lectures, 1879).

I am content, from the archæological standpoint, to maintain a negative argument against evolutionists as to the priority of polytheism in the religion of mankind, and that monotheism and Christianity have been "evolved" from it.

The discovery of the Tel-el-Amarna tablets, and recent excavations, under the auspices of the University of Pennsylvania, especially, have materially added to the evidence herein referred to, and further strengthened the cause of Biblical Theism. Archæology is accessory to the positive, and direct argument, which I will state hereafter. I will

but direct attention to some results which are inseparable from the hypothesis of evolution. The theology of evolution, as taught by "Lux Mundi," while it allows the unity of God, as truth, yet does so present the argument for that unity as a fact, that its character and order in the moral economy of the world is necessarily affected and changed thereby; it is, in effect, transposed. The results of such doctrine as related to the primary truth of the Divine character and government, are several and important. First, it leaves us without any authorized and Divine statement as to the creation of man, as it antagonizes the Mosaic account of the Creation, and, in fact, declares it to be a fable. Secondly, it essentially changes all the authorized and inspired statements concerning the plan of God's moral government of the world,—and, even of the Divine character. Thirdly, it revolutionizes the whole character of the New Testament, as a revelation of God,—because it practically nullifies the force and authority, as also the reliability of the law and the prophets. But, as the hypothesis not only destroys the unity of the Old and New Testaments, but is inherently antagonistic to the teaching, character and personality of the Lord Jesus Christ, as it cannot be made to harmonize either with primary theistic truths, or their ultimate and perfect revelation in and by Him, as also in and by Holy Scripture, it is, both logically and scripturally, untenable and self-condemned.

NOTE D

Positive Value of Theistic Evidences as Addressed to a Moral Agent

In taking an analytical view of natural religion as related to Theism, I have remarked that one aspect thereof may be regarded as describing duty taught, as it is applied to the human mind. Herein we include both the object and the subject; the evidence itself, and the beings to whom it is addressed. The evidence specially contemplated herein is all of objective nature, although the Providence of God, as related to that evidence cannot be excluded. This evidence is addressed not alone to man's intellect, but also to all of his moral nature, specially to his will, but to each of his moral faculties as they are necessarily correlated to each other. Hence, we are, here, considering the operation and subjective effect of intrinsic and extrinsic evidence. In presenting the theistic argument for the existence of God, it is inevitably necessary to distinguish between what is termed a priori and a posteriori evidence, but, as has been said, there is and can be no purely a priori argument, for the reason that the mind of man is, necessarily, more or less affected, although insensibly, by objective evidence.

Thomas Aguinas as quoted by Hettinger in his "Natural Religion" says, "In all knowledge there are two factors; the faculty that knows, and the object known." "This faculty,—the mind—like

the eye, can only see the objects that come within range of its vision. Thus, all knowledge is, primarily objective and, as we are constituted, derived from sense objects. Thus, there is the force of the axiom," "Nihil in intellectu, nisi prius in sensu." Hence any ex-parte view of the evidence is inadmissable and illogical. I mean that it is not to be regarded as merely a mental, but as a moral proposition, and, as presented to a moral and responsible agent. Both the works of God in creation, and the fact of His providence as Creator, are presented as facts in evidence to the whole of his moral nature as unto one who is amenable to God as moral governor. It is in view both of the adequacy of the extrinsic evidence, and of his intrinsic capability of estimating and receiving that evidence, that he is, hereafter, to be tried. Here then, we may properly first refer to what Dr. Chalmers has termed "The Ethics of religious enquiry." Here, we particularly regard the force of the evidence as addressed to a reasonable soul, and demanding, from its character and importance, a due and diligent attention. I quote a few sentences from Dr. Chalmers on this subject. "The Discerner of hearts sees whether, for the blessings innumerable wherewith He has strewed the path of every man, He be treated like the unknown benefactor who was diligently sought, or like the unknown benefactor who was never cared for." "The eye of a heavenly witness is on all these varieties, and, thus, whether it be dark-

ness, or whether it be dislike which hath caused a people to be ignorant of God, there is with Him a clear principle of judgment that He can extend even to the outfields of atheism" (pp. 72, 73, Chalmer's Natural Religion).

As a matter of fact, however, such an appeal is never made to man's reason, only; it is, also, to his moral affections and sense of duty. It is presented to him as what he ought to do, and such an appeal to his sense of right and of wrong is not and cannot ever be separated from an appeal to his will. It is under both these conditions of adequate objective evidence, and of ontological qualities of a distinctive character adapted to that evidence, that he must, necessarily, be tried. The anti-theistic and rationalistic arguments put forth against Biblical and elementary theism very generally ignore both the force in the evidence itself and in man's ontological character, and proceed upon the ground that it is to be treated simply as an intellectual and, what may be termed a mechanical proposition by which nothing is to be accepted as true that is not capable of absolute demonstration. This, I say, is a prime fallacy, both by reason of the subject matter in evidence, intrinsically regarded, and also for the equally decisive and sufficient reason that under such conditions, moral trial of man would be impossible. That man is possessed of moral capacities of knowledge, affection and the power of choice between what is right and what is wrong, is a

tangible and undeniable fact. It is, also, a self-evident fact that moral habit and choice, as exercised on moral truths, mature and determine character. It follows, therefore, that such trial of character must turn upon the moral conditions of faith, or unbelief, as exercised upon moral and spiritual objects, and not upon subjective and purely intellectual certitude; and as this is an inherent and necessary sequence from the premises, so is it the conditions asserted in the Word of God. Lastly, as this is the answer to be given to the positivist and philosophic sceptic, so, to the agnostic and latitudinarian, it is to be said that, as ignorance, moral uncertainty, or speculative hypotheses are unnecessary, because evidence is present and available, and to it man is morally subject. So, such plea, or argument of ignorance in respect of necessary knowledge is both inadmissable by reason, as it is also disallowed of God in Holy Scripture. I have before instanced the truth taught, by the conjunctive influence and operation of extrinsic and intrinsic evidence, duty to God may be and has been not only taught, but accepted or rejected of man by the law of natural religion. Not only does Holy Scripture teach us as to the actual reason, or cause of ignorance and moral estrangement from God and holiness, but palpable facts, and the experience of mankind go to shew that, in every-day life, a man's predilections, or his antipathies warp his judgment; while in questions of moral principle, or of

passion and self-interest, his determinating choice and course of action is habitually and generally governed not by his reason, but by his wayward passion and self-will. The bearing of this fact upon the subject before us is very apparent. I quote from Hettinger's Natural Religion (p. 29) some observations to this effect. "In all human science and knowledge, the will is the immediate and principal agent. For it is the will that finally determines the intelligence and which by its own power can reject any conclusion whether necessary or deduced" (Ulrici). "The human intellect is not a dry light, but receives a tincture from the will and affections; hence it generates knowledge in accordance with its wishes; for what a man would rather is true, that he will the more readily believe" (Lord Bacon, Nov. *Organ*, No. 1 : 49).

Hobbs says, "If men had any interests at stake they would doubt and deny the maxims of Euclid." "So, there are only two alternatives. A man either desires to know the truth, or he dreads to do so. In proportion to his moral declensions, he hates the truth which condemns him, and strives to silence its reproaches. But, he who fears not its voice receives with its accents light from above." It cannot be denied that the mind of man is naturally indisposed to admit objective evidence, specially upon moral and religious questions, that is not only contrary to his wishes, but as such is not favorable to him in the court of conscience as a moral and

accountable agent. This is particularly true of the will of man, if it be true that a man is known and characterized by what he loves,—specially as applied to moral objects—as the act of the will is the terminating point at which the character of an action finally receives its value and impress, it must be particularly true that the determinating act of the will not only affects, but also characterizes the judgment passed upon the evidence in accordance with the matured act and maturing character of the individual Ego. The determinating act of the will that decides to accept, or to reject, to do or not to do, not only characterizes the morality of the action as right or wrong; it, at the same time stamps the objective evidence upon which such determinative act is based in various degrees, as true or false, as related to the individual so acting and determining, as he acknowledges, or refuses to acknowledge and to act upon the evidence. It is this act of the will that is referred to by the prophet Isaiah, when he says (chapter 5 : 20), "Wo to them that call evil good, and good evil, that put darkness for light and light for darkness." So also, "Wo to them that are wise in their own eyes and prudent in their own sight." So also Solomon says, "He that saith to the wicked, Thou art righteous, him shall the people curse; nations shall abhor him." What a man has decided to do, he has also decided, in measure at least, to justify and to defend. When a man is in such a moral attitude

towards truth, and evidence presented to him, that he is biased against the evidence, he is like a packed jury that cannot give an impartial verdict. I find that Professor Flint considers the positive and conclusive argument for theism is such as I have herein expressed, and that it includes both objective and subjective evidence. He states it as follows,—"Our entire spiritual being is constituted for the apprehension of God through His works. All the essential principles of mental action when applied to the meditative consideration of finite things lead up from them to the Infinite Creative Wisdom. The whole of objective nature within us has been made for the reception and interpretation of that revelation. What more would we have?" (Theism Sec. 3, p. 379). Also on page 358, in giving one of the various definitions of faith he says, "This kind of faith (or trust in a person) like all other faith, ought to rest on the assent of the intellect to evidence, although what is characteristic of it is to be found, not in the intellect, but in the emotions and will. Since it constitutes and produces, however, spiritual experience, it is a condition and source, as well as a consequence of knowledge. There can, in fact, be no profound religious knowledge because no vital religion without it." This is an important statement, and admission, and I quote it with assent and approval; but I have had occasion, elsewhere, to shew that the general tenor of the author's teaching in regard to religious faith and knowledge

is not in accordance therewith. In fact the distinctive characteristic which he here admits is, elsewhere, at least ignored.

I have before referred to the fact that Principal Tulloch, in his prize essay on Theism, made all theistic evidences to culminate in moral intuitions as bearing witness to God. By this term, however, is to be understood, not immediate intuitions, inherent in and derived only from the mind itself, but, such intuitions as are the result of the complex and conjoint evidence of the whole of objective nature, and all of man's distinctive ontological and moral nature, as hereinbefore stated. I will here quote his language on this point. "And in thus abandoning all claim to demonstration, the evidence for the being of a God, so far from being weakened, is strengthened. For in all our knowledge there is and can be no higher warrant for reality than the grasp of intuition. What the soul thus holds by immediate presentation is, and must be, its most living possession, the source of all its own elaborate notions, and in comparison with which they are merely shadows. And thus it deserves to be added, the great truth of the existence of God is preserved as a truth of religion encompassed with a radiance of evidence which only the wilfully blind can fail to see, yet not mathematically demonstrated, that, or in order that they who devoutly seek the light may have gladness and reward in its discovery" (Prize Essay on Theism, p. 336).

It is to be noticed that not only does naturalism, as Mr. Balfour says, afford no provision for the æsthetic and ethical part of man's nature, but it seeks to abolish all radical distinction between right and wrong, and so do away with any necessity for the supply of such want. This substitute for Ethics, Hedonism or Utilitarianism, is fully answered by Mr. W. H. Lilly in his book on Right and Wrong. Cousin's Lectures on the True, the Beautiful, and the Good, set forth to my mind most clearly and satisfactorily what may be said to be the whole evidence for, and operation of natural religion from the moral intuitions and psychical characteristics of man, as exercised upon objective evidence for God. I will give a brief epitome. M. Cousin remarks in this connection that reason and reasoning are different things. Briefly stated, Reason in man as the distinctive faculty and the law divine of his life, although it is in man, has its root and origin in the absolute and the infinite. In this sense man is made in God's image. In this sense, we in Him (literally) "live and move and have our being." Thus, as Cousin says, our moral intuitions, or spontaneous intuitions are the true logic of nature. They require as they admit of no demonstration. They are of God, and lead up to Him. So of truth; what is true of the concrete is true of the abstract. The foundation or the ultimate source of truth is what he terms necessary and universal principles, and as the faculty of reason, in us, apprehends finite

truth as existent, such necessary and universal principles lead us to God by the light of reason, as the law of man's being.

Thus, the existence and personality of God is a primary truth, the basis of natural religion as it is addressed to moral agents. Yet, although attested by, and in conformity to reason, it appeals to man chiefly and distinctively by moral evidence, and by appeal to his moral nature, and, as we apprehend by our ontological and moral faculties, those universal principles of truth, beauty and goodness, they not only lead us up to God's personality, in whom they all originate, but as those moral qualities and objects commend themselves to our moral nature, these affections and desires of the human soul can find their satisfaction only in moral relationship to Him.

No substantial addition can be made to the judicious and admirable statement of Hooker—as already stated.

NOTE E

Of the Knowledge of God

I have already referred to a depreciation of natural evidences for God, from an erroneous conception of their proper relation to revealed truth (1) in the Holy Scriptures, and (2) as such evidences, both in nature and in the Old Testament,

stand related to the person of our Saviour and to the New Testament.

In the present remarks upon Divine knowledge, I wish to refer to a cognate error to those already spoken of, viz., to a depreciation of natural evidences objective and subjective, in order to magnify the work of the Holy Ghost in the conversion of sinners, as set forth in the New Testament, and to put them in contrast with the law of conscience, specially under natural evidences. It is first to be remarked that the knowledge of God, spoken of in Holy Scripture is of two kinds. We read of a knowledge of God that is available, and objective in character. This is of various degrees in its extent and involves proportionate responsibility. As distinguished from a saving and effectual knowledge, it carries with it a sense of such responsibility, and a sense of duty, merely. Such available knowledge is, everywhere in Holy Scripture, made chargeable against sinners, whether in heathen or in Christian lands. St. Paul says of the heathen that "they knew God, yet they did not glorify Him as God, neither were thankful" (Rom. 1:21). Again, he says, "Have they not heard? Yea verily, as it is written, Their sound went forth unto all lands, and their words unto the end of the world" (Rom. 10:18). Again, speaking at Lystra, Paul and Barnabas said, "Nevertheless He left not Himself without witness, in that He did good, sending us rain from heaven and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and

gladness" (Acts 14:17). So also our Lord (Matt. 5:45). Of such available knowledge of God, as enjoyed by the Jews, or in previous Christian era, it is not necessary to speak. I will only say that, whether under the light of nature, of the Old Testament, or under the Gospel of Christ, it is identical in character, though not in degree.

There is another kind of knowledge referred to in Holy Writ. This, as a result of objective evidences, in various degrees, is a true and saving knowledge. The knowledge before spoken of was resultant in conviction, merely, and a sense of duty and responsibility; this is resultant in moral and spiritual obedience of the heart unto righteousness, and what flows from it, *i. e.*, holy fellowship with God. This knowledge the wicked have not, because they have refused it. This sin is charged against all unconverted sinners. So, Jeremiah says (10:25) "Pour out Thy wrath upon the heathen that have not known Thee, and the kingdoms that have not called on Thy name." Why is such judgment denounced against them? Because they refused to know, or call upon Him. Similarly St. Paul said of the Jews who crucified our Lord and Saviour, "Because they knew Him not, nor the voices of the prophets which are read every Sabbath day, they have fulfilled them in condemning Him" (Acts 13:27). See also Luke 19:41, 42. Similarly is the language of Pharaoh to be interpreted, "I know not the Lord, neither will I let

Israel go." It is the language of deliberate rejection of God, and of His claims.

On the other hand, it is characteristic of the righteous, not only that they have an intelligent and highly spiritual perception of God's character and claims upon them, but that they have, through grace, yielded their hearts to Him, and also chosen, and so approved of His precepts. It is also to be noticed that God, on His part, so knows them that He approves of them, and regards them with special favor, and they are brought into holy reciprocity of feeling and moral relationship with Him (1 Cor. 8 : 3 and Gen. 18 : 17–19). As they love God and, through grace, make choice of Him and His ways, so God, on His part, loves them and approves of them. It is the distinctive feature of the condition of the righteous that their "fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ," as that they are the subjects of His transforming grace. I do not enlarge upon this, to us, familiar truth, but I would say that, although this is brought into clearer light by the New Testament, we should err in supposing that it is a blessing singular to the saints of the Christian era. As many who have not known the written word will be saved "without law," and without actual knowledge of a personal Saviour, or of the gospel plan of salvation, and, consequently, we may say also, without the same degree of spiritual enjoyment, yet, will they be saved through His death and merits; and, so, also many that have

not known the New Testament doctrine of the Holy Spirit's work, and His relation to the Lord Jesus Christ, have yet been subjects of the saving work of that one, and the self-same spirit who "sanctifieth all the elect people of God."

It is, therefore, illegitimate to seek to establish a necessary contrast between the law of conscience and the law of faith, for Holy Scripture draws no such contrast. Natural evidences of God may, by the Holy Spirit, enlighten and direct the conscience and cause it to be governed by the faith of those evidences, so given of God, and such faith is acceptable to Him, and conscience voices to the soul the fact of God's approval. We may affirm that a true and a sincere obedience to the law of conscience, and to the light possessed and attainable, is always acceptable to and rewarded of God; and, as a moral act and habit of life it is, as is every good in men, the fruit of the Holy Spirit's work upon the whole moral nature, so enlightened and governed. A remarkable instance of the error I here refer to is found in part of Dr. Thos. Goodwin's treatise on "The Work of the Holy Ghost in our Salvation" (Goodwin's works, Vol. VI). His teaching in regard to the knowledge of God under natural evidences, and the law of conscience, as related thereto, is injurious to fundamental principles of theism. His exegesis of Genesis 20, involving the character of Abimelech, King of Gerar, and his relation to God, and also his exegesis of Acts 23, where St.

Paul says, "I have lived in all good conscience before God unto this day," and which he so interprets as to support his inferences, I can only compare to the language of Bishop Gore in regard to our Lord's attitude towards the Old Testament Scriptures. At the same time I would express my sense of the excellency of the rest of the volume. The same error as to the force and value of natural evidences shewn in a depreciation of natural theology, natural religion, and in false exegesis of Holy Scripture, both doctrinal and historical, bearing upon this subject, is found in writers whose works in other respects are deservedly held in great esteem. Thus, Dr. Thos. Manton in his sermons on the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, has remarks of a similar character in regard to the knowledge and faith of the heathen, or Gentile nations. He says that "the heathen had knowledge of God sufficient for conviction, but not for conversion." Such doctrine was then held to be Biblical orthodoxy. The great master of theology, Dr. John Owen, held that God was not savingly knowable by His works in nature, or by natural religion (Owen on Forgiveness, p. 418). Also that forgiveness with God could only come through faith in the person of Christ, as revealed in the promise made to Adam at the time of the fall (Person and Glory of Christ, p. 124). The two propositions are consistent with each other, for, as the heathen under natural religion had not the Holy Scriptures,

they could not act faith on that promise, as revealed, and, upon the foregoing assertion (1) of the necessity of knowledge of that promise, and (2) of faith in Christ's person, as so revealed, they could not be saved. It is with great regret, as with diffidence that I express dissent from the teaching of Dr. Owen on this point. I shall not attempt to give my reasons in detail. I will state positively in as few words as possible my own conclusions. I think there can be no question as to the fact that there is but one way of salvation, and but one Saviour. This, however, does not entail absolute need and necessity of knowledge of the historic Christ, nor does it entail the necessity of knowledge of that first promise, or indeed of the subsequent promises made concerning Him in Holy Scripture. I do not, here, discuss the question whether God is knowable by natural law; I have done so. God has, herein, provided the minimum of knowledge required concerning Him, as moral governor, and as the Creator and Father of His creatures, in regard to the Old Testament revelations of God and of our Lord Jesus Christ (1) by prophecy and (2) by the law of sacrifice as related to forgiveness. The law of sacrifice did, parabolically, reveal an abstract principle of vicarious suffering, and also prefigure a sinless victim, a Saviour; it did not reveal the historic Christ, Jesus of Nazareth. So of the prophecies of Christ. They were more or less figurative, as was the law. They, too, revealed a

Personality, a Saviour, but not the historic Christ. Thus, faith in the promises and faith in the law of sacrifices was not a faith in Christ. I am of the opinion that, until the actual appearance on earth of our Lord Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whether it be under the law of natural religion or by the evidence of Holy Scripture, a true belief in the Lord Jehovah of the Bible has been a faith accepted of God, and also been a work of the Holy Spirit, as a belief of Him as both "a just God and a Saviour" (Is. 45 : 21). The whole of the chapter here quoted is full of evidence on this point, as to God revealed in nature, and God in His Holy personality, as the object of our faith. There has been, under the Old Testament, a graduation of truth, as revealing God's character, and also His counsels for man's salvation—whether that revelation is made by type or by prophecy—and, so, the degree of knowledge available has been graduated as to the way or method of God's saving mercy; but the faith required of God is a faith of the *fact*, and a faith in God's character as revealed to us by such evidence. I may again notice that our Lord frequently insisted on the fact that He was sent of God. A true belief in God as revealed includes evidence of Him as "a merciful God," a Saviour. So did He solemnly declare Himself to Moses when He made all His glory to pass before him (Ex 34 : 8). "And the Lord passed by before him and proclaimed, The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suf-

fering and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children and upon the children's children unto the third and the fourth generation. And Moses made haste and bowed his head towards the earth and worshipped."

I will, now, add that the essentially false conception given of God's character and being, by the representations I have referred to, and under the notion of exalting the Bible, as an inspired book, and of the exaltation of the New Testament to the disparagement of the Old Testament Scriptures, has actually fortified philosophic scepticism; and revealed religion at this day is suffering, at least collaterally and reflexively, from this radical, and I think I may correctly say, this gigantic error. Dr. Martineau in his "Study of Religion" has a chapter on the unity of God, as Cause and as Perfection; a leading idea therein expressed is this—The First-Cause of all things is not only the Supreme Force, and the Supreme Intelligence, but, as Creator and Preserver, He is absolutely the Perfect and Supreme Good, in Himself and to His creatures. Therefore, the belief in God, as First-Cause and Supreme Good, in Himself, must include among other moral qualities, a belief in His love and goodness, mercy and kindness, as these qualities are correlated to, and inseparable from each and every aspect and

quality of moral and spiritual, as well as natural and essential good, as such qualities and attributes of His being and personality. Only such a conception of Him can correctly be said to be a belief in God, *i. e.*, belief in a Self-Existent Personality, who is the Supreme, Essential, and Perfect Good.

The study of the sacred books of the East, or of comparative religion, although made the basis of both true and false inferences, has had the effect of directing greater attention to studies in fundamental theism, and to the subject of Christianity and the Bible as related to non-Christian nations and religious systems.

As Dr. Maclagan, the present Archbishop of York, has said, it has already and properly altered the attitude of the missionary in his approaches to the people to whom he goes, to instruct and to Christianize. I have referred to this subject in another place. The study of this topic may, and does, properly call for serious attention, as it stands related to Christian Theology, and to those who stand responsible for theological teaching.

CHAPTER IV

NOTE A

The Providence of God

As connected with the *experimental* aspect of this element of Theism I will make one or two references to Holy Scripture.

Moses (Deut. 8 : 4), points to God's Providence over the Israelites; and he appeals to their collective experience, and knowledge of it as instanced in *one* out of many remarkable particulars. He says, "Thy raiment waxed not old upon thee, neither did thy foot swell, *these forty years.*"

In like manner David in Psalm 105 : 37, epitomizes the events of the wilderness journey and of the Exodus; and he, as it were, quite *incidentally*, in the sketch there given of God's care over them, in their eventful history as a people, says, "He brought them out also with silver and gold and *there was not one feeble person among their tribes.*" This latter circumstance is to be read in connection with Leviticus 26, and Deuteronomy 28, where specific promises, and specific threatenings, are uttered and declared; and in which the transcendent personality, and supremacy of Jehovah are implied; and, so, specifically declared, and set before them.

It is further to be remarked that the passages I have quoted as illustrating the *pervasive* character of the Providence of God, and evidencing His transcendent operations, may with equal propriety be cited in proof and illustration of the *miraculous* acts of His transcendent Personality as Creator and Moral Governor; *this* fact, again, gives evidence of the homogeneity of the elements of Theism; and, also that the Divine *supernatural* is the distinctive, and the universal characteristic of *all* those elements; whether, as manifestations, or evidences in, and by His Works in the economy of Nature, and as related thereto, or by His Inspired and Written Word, as the complementum of evidence to His Personality and Will.

CHAPTER VI

NOTE A

Dr. de Costa, the Church of Rome, and "Lux Mundi" on Tradition

THE tract lately issued by the "Catholic Truth Society of Toronto," with reference to Holy Scripture and its assailants, is very suggestive. Referring to the teaching of the Higher Critics, and their renunciation of plenary inspiration, as distinctive of Holy Scripture, a claim is put forward on behalf of the Church of Rome that she, alone, is the maintainer of the plenary inspiration of the Old and New Testaments, and that she, alone, defines the just place and authority of Holy Scripture. Let us, first, notice how that she does, indeed, assert justly and truly, the Divine source and plenary authority, as well as the inerrancy of the whole of the Old and New Testaments. But, while acknowledging this to be a fact, it is to be coupled with another fact of primary importance, that this claim for Holy Scripture is made subservient to her doctrine concerning the Church, of which she claims to be the exclusive representative.

Holy Scripture, with her, is not the ultimate and supreme authority. Not only is the teaching and

decrees of the Church equally authoritative, but, as the Church is prior to Holy Scripture, in time, it is also prior to it in authority. In order to this, and tributary thereto, they teach that there has always been in the Church a tradition, by which the scripture is to be interpreted, and which, conjointly with Holy Scripture, is the authoritative rule of faith and duty. By these premises, the revealed will of God is found and expressed, primarily, and essentially, in a visible and organized corporation, known as the Church of Rome. All the doctrine and ritual of that church rests on this hypothesis. Authority and infallibility, with them, rests primarily and ultimately in the Church; and the inspiration and authority of Holy Scripture is held, only, as it is tributary and subservient to this primary and essential proposition. But, upon what is this hypothesis based? The answer is that it is based upon portions of the New Testament, and notably upon a false exegesis of the words of the Lord Jesus Christ to the Apostle Peter, "Upon this rock will I build My church." From this passage, in particular, the "church" hypothesis is derived, and other passages are so interpreted as to give color to the statement that the Bishop of Rome is the vicar of Christ upon earth; and based upon this theory and, as a part of the "church" hypothesis, the inferences drawn from Old Testament history are such as are in unison therewith. Accordingly, it is supposed that, both in the Old and New Testament eras, the Church, as an or-

ganized body, is the primary seat of Divine authority, and the source and centre of Divine truth. An important point to be noticed is this—the traditions, or oral teaching of this organized body has equal force and authority with the Holy Scriptures, and the teaching put forth by this body is equally incapable of error. When we consider that the Scriptures are to be received and believed, only, as this church, so inspired, interprets them, it is, at once, evident that all the doctrine it holds as to the Divine character of the Scriptures is merged into and identified with the Church, and so constitutes a theodicy of its own.

Christian theism, on the other hand, rests on the broad basis of objective and subjective evidences contained in nature, the human conscience and the Word of God in Holy Scripture. Holy Scripture is the complementum of Theism, and in itself constitutes the full, and final revelation of the Divine will. This is explicitly stated therein, and specially by the personal teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ. An examination of its texture goes to shew that it constitutes a cumulative and a culminatory revelation of God's character and will; that it comprises and also unifies and consolidates all the elements of Theism, and presents them as one harmonious and perfect whole. It will be evident that the doctrine of Holy Scripture in reference both to the Church and to tradition is radically different from that of the Church of Rome, and that while she makes the

Church and tradition to be of primary and paramount authority, Holy Scripture claims for itself such absolute and final authority; and its claim is supported by the teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ as the Messiah of God, and the Supreme Prophet promised to the Church. The authorized, just and Divinely constituted relation of the Church, as an organized and confessing body, to Holy Scripture, and the authority given to it, as such by the teaching of Holy Scripture, and that of our Lord and Saviour, is well and truly stated in the following articles of our Reformed Church, appended to the Book of Common Prayer, *i. e.*, Art. 6 "Of the sufficiency of the Holy Scripture for salvation," Art. 20 "Of the authority of the Church." The Church of Rome has adopted the doctrine of the Jewish Rabbis concerning tradition, and also concerning the Church, and with various accretions it is incorporated in their system. The Jewish doctors held that, besides the written law, delivered to Moses, on Mount Sinai, Moses received from God certain oral revelations which it was not lawful to write. These Moses delivered to Joshua and he to Eleazar, in a line of succession. On these, the Mishna and Gamara were founded, and these were regarded as of greater authority than the written law of Holy Scripture. Our Lord's great controversy with the Jewish Rabbis was that they had made the Word of God of none effect, by their traditions which they had delivered. Our Lord, on many occasions, emphat-

ically declared that Holy Scripture is the ultimate and supreme authority, as expressing the counsel and will of God, and, thus, is established a contrast between Sacred Traditions, in harmony with and authorized by Holy Scripture, and those Ecclesiastical traditions which are antagonistic thereto, and make it of none effect, while they give it a nominal place in but make it subservient to their system which gives the ultimate and governing power to an ecclesiastical corporation. But the teaching of the Church of Rome upon this subject, as set forth by Dr. deCosta, requires a little further notice. He (Dr. DeC.) identifies the oral, and the written and authorized teaching of that church, as proceeding from the Church (1) with this term, "tradition," and (2) with the Church, itself, whose voice it is. Further, he identifies this corporate body, the Roman Catholic Church, with the power, authority and infallibility belonging to and proceeding from the Divine Head of the Church, as set forth in Holy Scripture, even our Lord Jesus Christ, and he accepts it as axiomatic that the Bishop of Rome, in his personality and office, as head of that church, represents its unity and authority; and, as such representative, exercises peculiar, exclusive and universal authority as the vicar of Christ. The Church and its traditions are nominally and formally held to be of equal force and authority with Holy Scripture, as inspired of God the Holy Ghost; but only as that Church interprets Holy Scripture. Consequently, the authority

and infallibility, so predicated of Holy Scripture, depends absolutely upon the voice of the Church, as the primary and essential source and centre from which it is derived. For this reason, the Roman Catholic Church is not only the infallible interpreter of Holy Scripture, but it may and it does add thereto such accretions of doctrine as it may see fit to authorize and set forth. These accretions, in the Church of Rome, take the form of superstition and idolatry, as a form of error, peculiar to that system.

The theology of "Lux Mundi," and Bishop Gore set up the same claims for an ecclesiastical body as does the Church of Rome; and this ecclesiastical body for which "Lux Mundi" sets up such claim is by them falsely and scandalously identified with the Reformed Church of England.

The voice of this Church is authoritative and absolute in its claims. It claims to identify science, or pseudo-scientism, not alone with the authority proper and peculiar to Holy Scripture, alone, as the voice of God, but, by the voice of the Church and under the law of evolution with an authority that is absolute and primary, because it is the law of evolution; and the Church, as God's voice, declares the law and will of God by such law of absolute and universal evolution. Here is the same principle in regard to the powers of the Church, as is set forth in the Church of Rome, but the traditions of this body are rationalistic and secular, instead of being superstitious in character. Hence, it is sufficient to

say that the doctrine of tradition, as thus set forth, whether by the Church of Rome, or any other ecclesiastical corporation, does not represent the doctrine of Holy Scripture, in regard to traditions which we call sacred, from any point of view; whether we identify the same with the oral teaching of an inspired apostle, or with the testimony of facts concerning God's ways and doings in history, or the experience acquired by God-fearing and believing men of His dealings with themselves, individually, by His providence over them, or by the working of His Holy Spirit and His Holy Word within their hearts.

Dr. DeCosta says that "an infallible book requires an infallible interpreter." Assuming that this proposition is true, we are required by him to assume, also, that this "infallible interpreter" must necessarily be an infallible corporate body, and that this body corporate is the Roman Catholic Church, and that the Pope, as its head, is the infallible interpreter divinely given and appointed of God, as he is its official representative. Not only a very large, very gratuitous, but also a very irrational assumption. Dr. DeCosta's reasoning is illogical and ex parte. His premises,—as mere assumption—being false, the whole fabric falls by consequence, as a non-sequitor and a fallacy.

On the other hand, in support of the Protestant position, which he considers baseless, upon the stable premise that the Church of Christ is, pri-

marily and essentially, in its *esse* a spiritual body, we have not only the authority of Holy Scripture, but the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ, as the infallible interpreter of Holy Scripture, for saying that the individual members of that "live mystical body" shall be "all taught of God," and, therefore, that, being so taught, as He says of the Father, whosoever is so taught "cometh unto Me." This is not an isolated statement made by our Lord, for, although speaking first to the then living and existing members of the Church, He says, "When He, the Spirit of truth, shall come, He will lead you into all truth," "He shall teach you all things"—a promise not peculiar to the apostolate, but the heritage of every living and real member of, or believer upon Jesus Christ (John 16 : 13, 14).

CHAPTER IX

NOTE A

Theistic Basis of the Credibility of Miracles

IT may be premised that by a miracle we understand the *extraordinary manifestation of the perfections of God*, aside from the known laws of Nature. In the enquiry therefore of the credibility of miracles, such enquiry must be so limited, as applying to the rationality and veracity of the exercise and manifestation to us, in such manner, of the perfections of God. In the prosecution of such enquiry it is necessary, as a preliminary statement, to say that we can reason concerning God's operations, legitimately, but in one way, viz., in that He is the all-perfect personality. Our own personality, and our personal relations form the negative basis for an estimate of Him, and as He is related to us, and such negative basis is the highest vantage ground we can, so, occupy, as our personality, is the the highest point, in the field of nature, and of our knowledge and experience.

We are created and imperfect personalities; *He* is the uncreated and the perfect. The Book of God, by which He speaks to us, speaks of His per-

sonality in an accommodated sense, suited to our capacities of apprehension. Thus, we read of God's eyes, His mouth, and His feet, and His hands; so, also, do we read of His mind, His knowledge, His love, and His will. Reasoning, therefore, from God's personality as related to our own, we can but reason *negatively* and not positively, because that is beyond our experience. Elihu presented the claims of God, to Job, upon this basis (Job 33 : 12), and in the strongest possible way. When he said "God is greater than man;" and while using the comparative degree, because of the analogy of His person to ours, he is using it as the highest possible superlative, because it means that God is *inherently*, *essentially*, and *absolutely greater*. In the same manner are God's *relations* to us represented in accordance with our experience, and in an accommodated sense. God represents Himself to us as a Father, and as *our* Father. By our Lord Jesus Christ He is spoken of as "The Father," *i. e.*, The all-perfect Father, the highest conception of His real character, possible to us. The same rule and order applies to His moral attributes, as they are related to our moral qualities, as free and accountable agents. This aspect of God's personality, and being, presents to us sufficient and logical ground, as a negative basis, for belief,—from the premises stated, of the credibility of miracles as *immediate manifestations* of His personality.

As our moral faculties are correlated to each

other and are interdependent, the acts and habit of the *will*, in us, represents the individual ego, and *defines character*. All the moral faculties of the individual ego are permeated and possessed by the act and habit of the *Will:* and the will, so, represents the individual.

Such individuality is necessary to us as we are moral and accountable agents. Further than this: our own personalities are our ultimate, and highest possible apprehension of the perfect personality; but such apprehension is sufficient to this end.

We have and possess a relative freedom of action, as we are accountable agents; God, as the All-Perfect personality, and uncaused, is absolutely free, because He is absolutely perfect. The existence of God, as such personality, and such free-agent involves, and we may,—reverently—say, requires the *immediate exercise of His personality;* and, by *immediate* I mean aside from intermediate, and instrumental laws (by which He cannot be *limited*) of His operation; and by the analogy of the exercise of the human will as representing the Ego, and as *governing* and *describing* the individual personality and the individual character.

The *contrast*, however, between the act and habit, and so the character of the *human* will, so manifested, and that of *God*, is the *perfect* as contrasted with the *imperfect.* The immediate exercise of God's will has for its object absolute and *perfect good*, as it proceeds from Him, and so glorifies Him

however, or in whatever way exercised and manifested. The acts and habit of the human will are, *only* good as they are in *unison with* the declared will and character of God. It only remains to say that a *miracle*, as such act of God, is not limited or circumscribed as a manifestation of God's *power*, only; but, as such act, it declares, also, each and all of His moral attributes, as the perfect Good, and the perfect Personality.

CHAPTER X

Note A

Analytical Note on Conscience

It will be useful to take an analytical view of the faculty of conscience, viewed from a Scripture standpoint.

I have already said that I think, from that standpoint, we are to regard it as including all the faculties of the soul, as distinctive, in man.

At the risk of redundance, I will here, again, say that I think it is not to be confined to the *critical*, or judicial faculty of our moral nature; but, as one of the faculties of that nature, *i. e.*, the mind, the heart, or the will is frequently used to express the *whole;* so is it of *conscience*, that the judicial or mandatory quality is not to be separated from the intellectual quality. In 1 Cor. 8 : 11, 12, St. Paul evidently affiliates, and all but *identifies knowledge* (γνῶσις) with *conscience* (συνείδησις). "Through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom Christ died."

"But, when ye sin so against the brethren, and

wound their weak conscience, ye sin against Christ."[1]

The critical and judicial faculty is to be *regulated* by knowledge; it is even *responsible*, only, by, or through knowledge, as such knowledge is *available*, and known to be so; or, as it is possessed. So, St. Paul says (Rom. 14:12–23) in *deciding* a question of conscience, when the *mind* is uncertain, and, consequently, the question of true, or false, being *unsettled;* the moral sense is influenced in *precisely* the *same ratio*, and in the *same manner*.

When the intellectual faculty cannot, positively, say *yes*, the moral sense of *ought* is, in like manner, affected, and held in *abeyance;* it withholds its *assent* as to *right* or *wrong*, and, so, cannot say *ought*, or *ought* not. Therefore, it also requires the will to withhold its decision; and the want of the positive requires the negative, and the preservation of the *status quo*. "Therefore, he that doubteth is damned, or condemned, if he eat, because he eateth not of

[1] The argument of St. Paul in regard to *knowledge* of moral truth, not only goes to shew that such knowledge is *correlated* to conscience, or God-consciousness, as defining a sense of right and of wrong, and of moral obligation; but, that the knowledge that, so, *ministers* to such faculty is an essential part, and integral element of conscience itself, without which it could not exist. Also, it goes far to demonstrate the radical distinction of man, as a compound being, from the animals: that his ontological character is essentially distinct from the highest type of the irrational creatures, and that, ontologically and morally the unity of his own nature is completely and radically different from theirs.

faith; for, whatsoever is not (done) of faith, is *sin.*"

That is to say, he cannot *believe,* if the evidence is not satisfactory and sufficient to his individual knowledge, and judgment, and, so, binding upon his *moral sense;* and, if he acts *without,*—as equivalent to, *contrary to,* his convictions, and moral sense, he is held culpable before God, as having broken the law of conscience, or natural religion. This is the same argument that we find St. Paul using in Rom. 7 : 14–25, where he identifies the *ego* with the choosing faculty, as representing *all* the moral nature, because of the necessary interdependence between them. So the ego, or "I, myself," represents the *affections,* as they act upon the *will,* when he says, "I *delight* in the law of God, after the inward man."

So, "If I do what I *would not,* it is no more *I* that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me."

Our Lord's teaching as to the "single eye" is identical in character. Sincerity, or *integrity of purpose* is always identified with *holy affection,* and with *enlightened perception* as to moral truths; such is the general tenor of Scripture teaching; and such are the experimental facts.

We may further notice that as Holy Scripture speaks of a *pure* conscience, so in this moral distinction, it includes the *mind,* as well as the *affections* and *purpose.* St. Paul, in the Epistle to Titus, speaks of those whose "mind and conscience is defiled";—referring to the fact of evil *cogitations*

being habitually suggested to the *mind*, through the affections and will being so governed and directed, and, *so*, polluting the *conscience;* as the critical and mandatory faculty is, in a similar way, capable of being *perverted*, *hardened*, or *blinded.* The *antithesis* to this aspect of conscience is found in what St. Paul, elsewhere terms, "a pure conscience."

Describing the character of acceptable candidates for the Diaconate (1 Tim. 3 : 9) he says : "Holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience."

This probably refers to a sincere and obedient *faith* with all its concomitants.

Where St. Paul speaks of a purge, a cleansed conscience, in Heb. 9 : 14, he is *referring* to those concomitants, and tracing the effects to their proper cause. "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the Eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God ?"

Such a purgation not only includes all the moral faculties, as controlling powers of the inner life and character, but also of the body and its members, and of the outward life and conversation.

Note B

The Essential Elements of Theism Always in Evidence

Another and important point I wish to make,

in this connection, is the fact that during this early period of the world's history specially under consideration, *i. e.*, from the Creation to the Exodus; in addition to the cardinal evidence for God, as creator; (the basis of all subsequent evidence, mediate or immediate), there has been present, with the sole exception of a written and inspired law, every element of Theism and of supernatural religion. While historic Theism is characterized by progressive development of every evidence and element of truth, as an essential feature of the Divine economy; from the beginning of Sacred History those elements have been present in varying degrees of disclosure.

In reference to this fact it is further noticeable that Max Müller in his "Science of Religion," referred to by Sir Wm. Dawson, prefers to the more general terms, Natural, and Revealed Religion; which is simply a broad distinction between those *epochs of time* that were characterized by the presence, or absence of a dogmatic law, and an inspired Lawgiver, as historically regarded; a more precise, and accurate historical definition. In adopting a threefold distinction, or grouping of races, and religious character, as Turanian, Aryan, and Semitic, as a historic fact, and as describing different measures and degrees of Biblical Theism, he does so upon a scientific and critical basis; because, in addition to the cardinal fact of Theism, *i. e.*, that of Creation, and a Personal Creator with

its subjective results, the Semites, or descendants of Shem, held this belief and shared in its benefits, together with those derived from other elements of a distinctly supernatural character, as hereinbefore dealt with, and declared from the standpoint of Bible History; and, *this* is evidenced to us by the fact that the traditions held by them of various incidents of Historic Theism, correspond with the accounts thereof given to us in the Mosaic narratives, in the books of Genesis and Exodus. The special point here to be made is the fact that while *degrees* of traditional knowledge of God are to be traced in these three great divisions of the human family; the *minimum* of natural knowledge of God, *i. e.*, by Creation and Providence, was possessed by them all; and, in Noah's prophetic declaration concerning Shem, we are to trace, even at that early day, a Divine purpose, that through his posterity God designed to preserve and transmit those *immediate* revelations of, and from Himself, which were, afterwards, given as a sacred deposit to "the seed of Abraham." That there was,—afterwards, or in subsequent ages, a manifest *method*, or plan, of a Divine character, for the *mediate diffusion* of Theistic knowledge among other nations, by means of the Sons of Jacob, we gather from Moses' Song, recorded in the 32d Chapter of the Book of Deuteronomy.

We are told in the seventh and eighth verses, "When the Most High divided to the nations their

inheritance, when He separated the sons of Adam, He set the bounds of the people according to the number of the Children of Israel"=the Sons of Jacob.

As I understand it, He did so, in a manner similar to their location of God in the promised land, or, by a settled method, and order. In short, that God had, *ever*, in His moral government, a method or plan for the *reflexive diffusion* of His truth among the nations of the earth; and, that in His purposes of everlasting salvation, all races of men had a place, and were included.

Sufficiency of Elementary Theism

If we have realized, as a fact and actuality, the existence of God, we have, in such realized actuality that to draw upon which far transcends all our actual necessities. The character and sufficiency of God can only be learned by *experience of Him.* We require to come into conscious, and voluntary contact with His personality, in order to "know Him"; and this is the only adequate, as well as the only possible knowledge that we can have of Him. We may say that we arrive at this conviction by an *a posteriori* argument, and from the standpoint of the highest degree of objective knowledge that is possible to us, or that is appointed of God, *i. e.*, God as revealed to us in Jesus Christ.

Job occupied a lower standpoint, when after surveying the evidence, he said, "Lo these are parts—

(Kitzoth dĕrākāyīv) *lower parts* of His ways; but how small a portion is heard of Him! but the thunder of His power, who can understand!" (Job 26 : 14). No other than this can be said even from the Christian standpoint. Notwithstanding the realized fact of a revealed Christ, and all the fulness of the Holy Spirit's ministry, religious life individually and personally considered is a life that has the personality and character of God for its alone object of hope and dependence; and it is His character, and attributes as necessary and essential facts and verities that the individual soul is, as declared in Christ, taught to anchor its hopes upon.

As an objective fact, Christianity is but the *effect* or *complementum* of the fact of God's existence and character. The sum and the substance of all the training and teaching of a lifetime, in the history of any one of God's dear children is but the deepened and perfected realization of the fact that *God*, in Himself, is and contains everything to and for His creature, Man; and, also, everything that he, himself, desires and longs for, and *now* finds his highest satisfaction in.

All this is expressed and contained in the words of our Lord in His Intercessory Prayer: "And *this* is Life Eternal; that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent." It is too true that men may, and do depreciate the evidence supplied of God in Nature, bearing testimony to Him; and it is equally true that

after having apprehended the initial fact, we may, and we do too inadequately apprehend the grandeur and immensity of the necessary sequences which that fact contains, and what it *secures* to us.

NOTE C

Moral Obligation to Seek God

IN this connection, Bishop Butler, in his Analogy, Part II, Chapter VI, has some very weighty and valuable remarks, from which I make some quotations. The whole chapter is replete with argument upon this point.

Page 424—"If we put the case that, for the present, it was *intended*, revelation should be no more than a small light, in the midst of a world greatly overspread, notwithstanding it, with ignorance and darkness; that certain glimmerings of this light should extend, and be directed, to remote distances, in such a manner that those who really partook of it should not discern from whence originally it came; that some, in a nearer situation to it should have its light obscured, and in different ways and degrees intercepted; and that others should be placed within its clearer influence, and be much more enlivened, cheered and directed by it; but, yet, that even to these it should be no more than 'a light shining in a dark place;' all this would be perfectly uniform, and of a piece with the

conduct of Providence, in the distribution of its other blessings."

Page 425—"And, lastly, that others have had Christianity offered to them in its genuine simplicity, and with its proper evidence, as persons in countries and churches of civil and of Christian liberty; but, however, that even these persons are left in great ignorance in many respects, and have by no means light afforded to them enough to satisfy their *curiosity*, but only to *regulate their life*, to *teach them their duty*, and *encourage them* in the faithful discharge of it: I say, if we were to suppose this is somewhat of a generally true account of the degrees of moral and religious light and evidence which were intended to be afforded mankind and of what has actually been, and is their situation in their moral and religious capacity, there would be nothing in all this ignorance, doubtfulness, and uncertainty in all the various, and supposed disadvantages of some in comparison with others, respecting religion, but may be paralleled by manifest analogies in the natural dispensations of Providence, at present, and considering ourselves merely in our temporal capacity."

Page 428—"The evidence of religion not appearing obvious, may constitute one part of some man's trial, in the religious sense: as it gives scope for a virtuous exercise, or vicious neglect of their understanding, in examining, or not examining that evidence."

"There seems no possible reason to be given why we may not be in a state of moral probation with regard to the exercise of our understanding upon the subject of religion, as we are with regard to our behavior in common affairs."

Page 429—"Thus, that religion is not intuitively true, but a matter of deduction and inference; that a conviction of its truth is not *forced* upon every one, but left to be, by some, collected with heedful attention to premises: this, as much constitutes religious probation, as much affords sphere, scope, opportunity, for right and wrong behavior, as anything whatever does. And their manner of treating this subject when laid before them, shews what is in their heart, and is an exertion of it."

"If there are any persons who never set themselves heartily, and in earnest to be informed of religion; if there are any who secretly wish it may not prove true, and are less attentive to evidence than to difficulties, and more to objections than to what is said in answer to them; these persons will scarcely be thought in a likely way of seeing the evidence of religion though it were most certainly true, and capable of being ever so fully proved" (p. 438).

There seems to be no pretense, *from the reason of the thing*, to say, that the trial cannot equitably be anything, but whether persons will act suitably to *certain information*, or such as admits no room for doubt; so as that there can be no

danger of miscarriage, but either from their not attending to what they *certainly know*, or from overbearing passion *hurrying* them to act contrary to it:

"For, since ignorance and doubt afford scope for probation, in all senses, as really as intuitive conviction, or certainty; and since the two former are to be put to the same account as difficulties in practice; men's moral probation may also be, whether they will *take due care* to *inform themselves* by *impartial consideration*, and, afterwards, *whether they will act* as the case requires upon the *evidence which they have*, however doubtful."

"It ought to be forced upon the reflection of these persons, that our nature, and condition necessarily require us, in the daily course of life, to act upon evidence much lower than what is called *probable;* to guard not only against what we believe will, but also against what we think it supposable—may happen; and to engage in pursuits when the probability is greatly against success, if it be credible that, *possibly*, we may succeed (pp. 433–34.) The foregoing remarks, as the whole of the chapter, from which they are taken, are designed to shew as they do most conclusively, that the world is, and ever has been, in all its parts, under the just and equitable moral government of God, whether it be with, or without the knowledge of His Holy Word, or in whatever degree that knowledge is enjoyed, or withheld. That at all times,

and under all circumstances man is laid under the just and reasonable obligation of *seeking Him diligently*, and of carefully acting upon such knowledge as He affords in each case and in each time and circumstance; and, in doing so he has the security of God's own character that He will be nigh to all that call upon Him; to all that call upon Him in truth" (Ps. 145:18). Dr. Chalmers' weighty words, already quoted, are to the same effect, as Bishop Butler's.

The radical difficulty is, as it always has been since man became a sinner—*not* that he is without light and knowledge concerning God, and duty; none have been or are, *absolutely* without such knowledge; and, as a *minimum*, of an adequate degree of such knowledge as may qualify them for a due discharge of their duty, both to God, and to their fellow-men; but the precise and actual difficulty is found in man's natural *aversation* to fulfil such duty; and (to trace it to its original, and source) his inherent aversation to seek and *enquire after God.*

This, by a Divine Law, is held as a first duty chargeable upon him as a moral agent, under law to his Creator: I say to enquire, *first, after God;* and, then to enquire after the law of truth derived from God, and provided by Him, as the law to govern his life and conversation. This aversation is the first charge laid against man, as a sinner, in God's Holy Word. David, speaking by the Holy

Ghost, says in Psalm 14:2: "God looked down from heaven upon the children of men to see if there were any that did understand, and seek God;" and again in Psalm 82:5, "They *will not* be learned nor understand, but walk on still in darkness." And, most pointed is the testimony to the same effect in Ps. 10:4: "The wicked, through the pride of his countenance, will not seek (lo dārash): in all his thoughts, God is not (ayen elo-hīm) or, as Gesenius has it, "There *is* no God: such are all his thoughts" (or cogitations). So David says again, in Ps. 53:1, "The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God," *i. e.*, God *is* not: (ayen elo-hīm). Such is his *wish.*

As everywhere declared in holy writ,—it is the aversation of his *whole moral nature;* (sometimes expressed by one faculty, and sometimes by another, but, terminative upon his *will*), that is set *against God: His* mind, *His* will, and *His law.*

Nowhere is this more plainly stated than in the Book of Job, and it is stated there as a familiar and accepted fact. Against such an aversation and enmity is the paternal and patient love of God, as the universal Father of mankind, in all the perfections of His holy personality, directed in one continuous moral controversy. To the passages I have quoted I will add the words of our Lord in John 12:35, where He says to the cavilling Jews, "*Walk*—while ye have the light, lest darkness come upon you: for he that walketh in darkness knoweth not

whither he goeth." There is reason to believe that our Lord has reference, here, to the words of Jeremiah, in the 13th chapter of his Prophecy, verses 15 and 16. With the words of our Lord may also be connected the utterances of St. John in his first General Epistle, concerning the same subject; and where he classes the righteous and the wicked as children, respectively, of light and of darkness, chapter 1: 5–7, and chapter 2: 8–12. So also, St. Paul in 1 Thess. 5: 4–8. It is to be noticed that such contrast is a contrast not only of character and disposition, but also, and emphatically of a character that is *self-determined*, as one of their own personal and actual *choice*.

In view, then, of this rudimentary truth, as evidenced in Holy Scripture, and in the experience of daily life, we may draw a probable and just inference in regard to God's moral government, as related thereto. By this fact we may consider that, not only is His supreme *wisdom*, as moral governor, so declared and manifested in regard to the graduation of religious light and opportunity in the world, and in the *withholding* of the major, or maximum degree from so large a portion of the human family; *because* we may reasonably infer that, in *view of all the facts*, it may, actually, and as seen by Him who alone is competent to judge, be known to be a merciful, as well as a just disposal, as it stands related to the necessarily free, and responsible action of moral agents; in which, as the *basis* of moral

trial, *their free-agency must be a controlling factor.*

What we may, and should, properly, emphasize and magnify, as to its character and degree, is the fact of man's radical "alienation from the life of God" (Eph. 4: 18), as a fallen being, and a sinner.

This, also, we may with absolute confidence affirm to be true: *i. e.*, None ever sought God sincerely, and with their whole heart, and sought Him in vain.

NOTE D

The Will as Related to the Conscience

BUT, it is desirable to trace more particularly the connection between conscience and the determinative faculty, or *will.* Conscience is termed, by our Lord Himself, the *eye* of the soul. Not in an abstract, or general sense, but, with reference to the individual.

We have seen that the faculty of reason, and understanding is peculiar to man, as *the* law of his being, ontologically considered; as well as the law given him of God for the governance of his life. The ontological faculty of reason and understanding is brought to bear upon various objects; that is to say upon both material objects, and upon moral evidences, considered in themselves, and as related to God, as Creator and Governor. It is with the

moral evidences that we are, here, concerned. Moral evidences are present and available, to all men; although in different degrees. That this proposition is true, has, I think, been hereinbefore demonstrated. The individual has a responsibility in regard to such available knowledge of moral truth. The requisite and responsible knowledge is elementary and simple in character, as that which is necessary to regulate conduct, and to mould character. It has been tersely, and fittingly described as "the true, the beautiful, and the good!" As related to the conscience, it is defined in Holy Scripture, as "the thing that is right" (Ps. 37: 37, Prayer-book version).

The discriminative faculty of the soul, appealed to by Theistic evidences of God, and of moral truth is not simply a critical, or intellectual faculty; it is correlated to another quality, or faculty that is capacitated to love, or to hate, as related to God, and to moral objects. These as moral qualities of the soul perform, each, their several functions in relation to such objects, so presented in evidence; yet, the action of one moral quality is reciprocated and influenced by that of the other.

So the terms Right, and Wrong, as moral terms, represent the moral discrimination exercised, not only in regard to the true and the false, but also in regard to the good, and to the evil, morally considered.

That is to say, what right reason regards as

morally *true*, and what right moral affection holds to be worthy of the soul's *desire*, and *delight*. The same applies in regard to the terms *good*, and *evil*. Moral truth and moral goodness are not separable qualities either in themselves considered, or as related to their Divine source and original: that is, to God Himself, as the perfect good. Yet, there is a *direct* appeal, by objective evidence, to that faculty of the soul which discriminates between the *true*, and the *false*, morally considered; and we have seen that such objective evidence, under natural law presented to such faculty, is adequate to meet all the *requirements* of God from man, under a just, and a beneficent moral government. In considering the relation of such objective evidence to that faculty which discriminates, especially between what is morally *good*, and what is morally *bad*, we have to take into account the fact (which applies to all the moral faculties of the soul), that man has lost that equilibrium which he once possessed. He is born into the world with a *bias* of his nature, and specially of his moral *affections* towards that which is *intrinsically evil*; "the law of sin" has prevalence in his moral nature. But, notwithstanding this fact, as God has in no case left him without available *knowledge* of truth and of right, so He has not left him without available *help*, to counteract "the law of sin."

As he needs supernatural help, under moral trial, so God does, in no case, leave him *absolutely*

unaided, and at the mercy of that affection, or predisposition to evil which he inherits.

"Even a child is known by his doings, whether they be pure, and whether they be right" (Prov. 20 : 11).

The malignant character of indwelling sin, as a fact, is not to be minimized; but, it is also a fact in the consciousness of every person, that the growth, and development of such moral affection, as it is alienated from God, is something for which he is individually, and personally responsible. If he is progressively developing, by habit, his inherited tendency to evil, it is because he has not listened to, nor obeyed the voice of conscience; nor sought help and assistance from God in prayer, to *counteract* such evil tendency of his nature by a Divine and supernatural work upon his soul, which he might know that he needed, and that God was ready to give. No person becomes or *can* become a confirmed evil character *at once*. All his moral nature is *under trial*. This trial terminates on the choosing faculty, or will; but, before such determinate act, or series of acts takes place, conscience, as "the eye" of the soul, the συνεσις and συνειδησις, not only *instructs*, but entreats; approves, or disapproves according to such purpose, and determinate action matured in the soul. So, the individual character is determined by moral law. The power to know, the power to love, the power to choose, and the power to do, is not, indeed, inherent; but,

it is available, and so the *ego*, as a self-conscious personality, is the subject of a just judgment. If man is ignorant it is chargeable upon all his moral nature; if he loves the evil, he is conscious that he might do otherwise; if he definitely chooses, purposes, and practices what he knows to be wrong, although culpability rests upon, and is participated in by all the moral faculties, that culpability is specially chargeable upon him *as a voluntary agent.* The power of choosing, and of refusing, of purposing and determining, in view of available evidence, although it may be neglected or refused; while such capacity is not inherently, and independently possessed, while it is actually under a prevalent *bias to* evil, and against the good, is held *directly* and we may say chiefly responsible, because of the special function allotted to it of God; and, because, as in the case of the faculty of *knowledge*, and of *love*, such adequate, and supernatural, and extraneous assistances were, to him, consciously available in God; who, from His character as *the good*, "will not suffer man to be tempted above that he is able, but will, with the temptation make, also, a way of escape, that he may be able to bear it;" and, also, He is *faithful* to do so.

It is also to be considered that God has provided both without and within man, for an appeal, not merely to the intellectual and rational faculty of the soul, but to the moral power of *loving* what the intellectual faculty, as an integral part of his moral

nature shows him to be *worthy* of his supreme affection, as it is both Right and Good. Right, in itself considered, as it is conformable to the sense of *duty* which he is conscious that he owes to God; and *good* also, in itself considered, because of the love and beneficence manifested, both in the law, and in the lawgiver. I am here dealing particularly with natural law, so I do not refer to the revelations of the law-supernatural, further than to notice that it is a remarkable fact that our Divine Lord in inculcating the law of love and beneficence to our fellow-men enforces it by such a display of God's beneficence as is evidenced in the economy of natural law, and of providential government.

"That ye may be the children of your Father that is in heaven; for He causeth His sun to shine on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust" (Matthew 5 : 45). But, while each appeal to one moral faculty of our nature is reciprocated by and is correlatively addressed to *all* those faculties, the determinating point which characterizes the individual *ego* is reached and defined in the repeated acts and habit of *the will;* by which *action* is determined, *purpose* is directed, and, so, character is formed.

The affections are appealed to through the rational nature, and, so, action of the whole man,—body and soul,—is *solicited.* The will is—therefore,—governed by the object predominating in the affections of the soul; but the whole moral nature

as represented by the conscience of the individual man, or woman, is held responsible.

Therefore, we say that,—ultimately,—the will is the *ego:* "I, myself."

It fixes responsibility, and stamps character; and all experience, facts, and history go to shew that man, as a transgressor, against God, in all times, in all places, does not actually disobey God and good as His declared law, because he is unable to discriminate between right and wrong, good and evil; nor because he is not conscious of the intrinsic amiability and excellency of the good to which he is solicited to *yield himself;* but, as a transgressor, he does so transgress, not only voluntarily, but wilfully and wickedly.

His whole moral nature, and physical energies are, in fact, *yielded to it.*[1]

[1] The determinative power of the will is constantly appealed to, both in the Old and New Testaments; and it is often implied when not expressed. I shall but quote one passage, and from the New Testament. After referring to those on whom the tower, in Siloam fell and slew them, and to the Galileans, whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices, our Lord says: "Think ye that *they* were sinners above all that dwelt in Jerusalem? I tell you, Nay; but except *ye* repent, ye shall all,—likewise, perish." The reference, here, is clearly, to the determinative, or choosing faculty, as representing the individual ego, and, as the ultimate seat of accountability; and, as that responsible free-agency is, so, recognized and declared by our Lord, in this place. so, in Acts 17:30, St. Paul most forcibly asserts God's *authority.*—as demanding, and *justly* demanding its rightful and proper exercise,—when he says that God "now commands all men, everywhere to repent,"—because of the approaching day of judgment, by our Lord Jesus

The strong statements of Holy Writ to this effect, are verified by the declared facts of human experience; and, so are fully justified. To quote but two passages, "Who rejoice to do evil, and delight in the frowardness of the wicked; whose ways are crooked, and they froward in their paths" (Proverbs 2 : 14, 15).

"Who, knowing the judgment of God that they that do such things are worthy of death,—not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them" (Rom. 1 : 32).

In fact Holy Scripture abounds with references that declare not only the wilful blindness and indifference manifested to the will and counsel of God, but hatred of it, love of evil, and inveterate choice of it at all hazards. Such are the necessary fruits and operations of sin, and to such a developed habit and character does sin inevitably tend.

The history of the individual sinner is the record of a series of acts in the secret chambers of the soul. They are acts of *each* of his moral faculties.

They are reciprocated by all. They are negative and positive acts.

They are progressive in habit and character.

Christ. I will but say that the same just and inexorable demand is and has been made no less really, truly, and universally, under natural evidences, and natural law; although made more imperative by reason of an increased measure of available knowledge.

They are a continuous assimilation, and identification of the soul with moral evil. Sin is, so, loved and chosen, rather than holiness. By continuous acts of the *will*, sin is stamped upon the soul. Sin asserts its supremacy therein, by the determinating act of the will, as the responsible *ego*. So, in like manner, under the moral law of truth and grace, by consideration of the evidence, a new affection is produced and a new purpose formed.

The several faculties of the soul, as correlated to each other in the performance of their several functions, come under its influence by the power and pervasive influence of God's Holy Spirit. There is an internal and counter influence, by the law of sin, "even in them that are regenerate"; but the acts of faith and of repentance (*μετάνοια*), and of love, are continuous and persistent in character.

The soul in its several moral qualities is pervaded by truth and love, and the *ego* is progressively yet *definitely* identified with moral good, and affiliated with God.

Each prevalent affection, and aspiration of the soul, as regarded in the aggregate character of the *life*, and measured by its dominating characteristic is *towards God and goodness.*

"Nearer *my God* to Thee, nearer to *Thee*," is the key-note. "O, God, Thou art *my* God; early will I seek Thee."

So, "The Way of Life is an ascension to the wise,

that he may depart from hell beneath" (Prov. 15 : 24). [1]

As the motion of the holy and renewed soul is *towards God*, so, awful though it be, as a fact, yet, it is certainly true that the conscious, progressive, and determinate purpose, affection and habit of the sinner is not only identifying him with sin, but also with Satan. "This wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthy, sensual, devilish" (James 3 : 15).

I pursue this no further, here, save to remark that our Lord's own utterances are very direct and explicit; and the severe words which He used to the Pharisees are fully applicable to all unconverted sinners.

NOTE E

Dr. Martineau on Intuitional Knowledge of God

THE following beautiful passages from Dr. Martineau's "Study of Religion" are strictly logical

[1] The Hebrew (lemāelāh) means, literally, "for an ascension;" and the word māelāh is applied to those Psalms which are called "Songs of degrees," because (as Gesenius concludes) of their climacteric character.

Hence we are directed to the fact of a moral and spiritual *elevation of character* as contrasted with that of continuously getting *lower*, until it terminates in endless ruin. Literally rendered, "The way of life is for an ascension to the wise," *i. e.*, as to its character, it is so ordained of God; and, such is its continuous tendency.

inferences from the objective evidence, and from the experience of conscience, and stand properly connected with the latter topic.

"In other words, the moral law first reaches its integral meaning when seen as impersonated in a Perfect Mind, which communicates it to us, and lends it power over our affections sufficient to draw us into Divine communion. How else could it transcend our whole personality as it does, and haunt us with tones from beyond and above? If our humanity were at the summit, and in passing further, we emerged into blank silence, how could these subduing voices flow thence upon the heart? They attest a speaking nature there that bids us feel as it feels, and become the organ of its thought; a nature that appealing to us from a superhuman height, cannot be less than a conscious will, but simply a personal and holy Mind; and that reporting to us a Law which holds for all thinking and voluntary beings, is universal and supreme. Here, at last, and here alone does the objective authority of what the universal conscience tells, find its explanation, and its home; and hither, it is that we are brought, in proportion as our self-knowledge is deep, and our moral ideal is lofty and complete. I care not whether this be called an immediate *vision* of God in the experiences of conscience; or whether it be taken as *an inference* from the data they supply. It is the truth contained in them: with one man it may be only implicitly felt in their

solemn and mystic character; with another, explicitly and immediately seen emerging from them as they come, and making him the Seer of God rather than a reasoner about Him. In any case, the constitution of our moral nature is *unintelligible*, except as living in response to an objective perfection, pervading the universe with holy Law."

NOTE F

Force of Intuitional and Moral Evidence, as Stated by Our Lord Jesus Christ

THE important utterance of our Lord in Luke 12: 54–58, before quoted, requires further consideration, as it stands related to Natural Religion, and the Law of Conscience.

It may, I believe, be said to convey authoritative declaration of the sufficiency of Theistic evidence under natural law, in all that is essential to human responsibility.

The argument is based upon the fact that man, by his experience of the sequences of physical law is competent, by such evidence, to acquire the knowledge of a Supreme First-Cause, as Lawgiver, in regard to such sequences. Upon this basis our Lord proceeds further to assert His capability of acquiring a knowledge of His moral government, in the promulgation and dispensation of *moral* and *spiritual* truth.

The reference already made to the phrases, "this way," "this time," "this life," and "this name," will sufficiently illustrate and make clear the scope and purport of our Lord's teaching in this place. The first question put to their moral consciousness of law and accountability is, "*How is it* that ye do not *discern this time?*" Notice, also His scathing words, that precede the question, "*Ye hypocrites!*" So much, then, for the objective evidence for God in Natural Theology.

His *second* question follows as the climax and logical sequence of the former; "Yea, and *why, even* of *yourselves* judge ye not *what is Right?*"

The reference, here, is to the argument not alone from conscience, but from the *whole* of man's moral faculties. It may properly be considered that our Lord herein teaches that even without reference to objective evidence, relatively, if not absolutely; by reason of his intellectual, and moral nature, as constituted of God, man has necessary and ontological capacity, by which he may discern Right from Wrong, as he is under accountability, as a moral agent.

More than this: our Lord's teaching places before us the fact that the ultimate issue in the moral trial of man, as he is a responsible being, and a free agent, is *self-determined.* Analysis of this weighty utterance goes to show that while God has never left Himself without witness, in some measure of objective truth, and testimony; yet, the

responsible attitude of man's personality, in relation to Him, as Judge and Lawgiver,—and the character that is to determine his future in another world does not, by any means, depend upon the *degree* of that evidence.

Still more distinctly is it in evidence that it is not determined by the degree of intellectual development, that mental culture, and external aids and advantages may procure; and, if man's moral trial and maturity of character is not effected, absolutely, *without* objective evidences of Theistic truth, even in nature; that the effectual and cooperative witness of a light within the soul, is the *ultimate force*, in and by which God's action as a moral governor will, in the great Future, be both declared, and justified.

Note G

Heathen Ignorance, its Cause and Character

As every Theological principle must have its own corresponding effect upon the practical work of the Church, as it has upon individual religious life, and what is to be set forth as individual and Christian duty; so of this particular subject. It is therefore desirable to give it some special consideration.

As cosmical Evolution excludes a personal Creator, and dismisses the Bible story of Creation,

and of the Fall, as a myth, and denies it to be History, or the Divine and authoritative statement of fact, and of elementary truth; so do Evolutionists deny the elementary doctrine of Original Sin. So does Dr. Lyman Abbot. We can understand how necessary it is to the coherence of their hypothesis, for Evolutionists to deny the doctrine of Original Sin; it does but indicate, from this standpoint, how radically, and diametrically that hypothesis is opposed to Bible truth. Original Sin, as the result of Adam's fall, is *the* foundation truth of Biblical Theology, and of Biblical Religion. Historical, Doctrinal, Practical, and Experimental Religion are bound up with it. It is homogeneous with the whole facts, and character of both the Old and New Testaments.

Moreover, the doctrine of Holy Scripture, as built upon the Fall of Man, is the only sufficient and satisfactory solution of all the present evils, physical and moral, bearing sway in the World. Although Bishop Gore treats the story of the Temptation, in Eden, and the Fall, as myth, and not History, yet, Mr. Illingworth and other Essayists, in "Lux Mundi," fully admit the existence, operation, and power of sin, as a chief factor in human life, "apart from the question of its *origin*."

Dr. Lyman Abbot speaks of the "gradual growth of the spiritual life within, until an almost absolute perfection shall have been attained!"

He puts this principle in antithesis with the Bible doctrine of inherent depravity, and denies the character, and cause of sin, as set forth in Holy Scripture, and, so, its *results*, as a religious principle, upon the life. That is to say, he squares his teaching (logically) with the Evolutionary hypothesis.

Mr. Scott Holland says that *faith* (and, so, religious character), is, "by conscious receptivity, capable of an evolution of which it is impossible to fix a *limit!*" ("Lux Mundi," p. 14). Upon the hypothesis of Evolution concerning Man, as an "ascent from the animals," the degree of his knowledge,—in primitive, and ante-diluvial times, is required to be of a very low order. Hence, too, it is requisite to the coherence of their theory, that Theistic evidences under Natural Law, must have been (hypothetically), of an uncertain character. Further, as a consequence, the *ignorance* of the Heathen, from the days of Seth downwards, must be put upon very different grounds, by the Theology of Evolution, and by the principles and facts of Biblical Theism, respectively considered. I would notice the fact that, in the Theodicy of "Lux Mundi," the Essay by Dr. Talbot, on "Preparation in History for Christ," is not only coherent with the denial made by other Essayists of the Bible doctrine of Original Sin, but it is, also, coherent with Universalism, *i. e.*, Universal Salvation.

In prosecuting the enquiry as to the cause and

character of heathen ignorance, we may treat it as an abstract question, from the standpoint of Christianity; but, the final solution rests with the historical, and doctrinal teaching of our only final and absolute authority, viz., God's Word, written.

I will, therefore, first remark that there is a popular misconception as to heathen ignorance which is of long standing, but which may now be said to belong to the past. This principle has obtained currency, largely in consequence of exaggerated statements on missionary platforms as to the hopelessness of the condition of heathendom, without the Word of God. Traced to its origin, it must be found in a loose and careless Theology; and it is, actually, based upon a false assumption that *no degree* of knowledge of God was *possible*, from Natural evidences. This, by implication, ignores, or depreciates the value of Natural Theology and Natural Religion.

The comparative study of non-Biblical religious systems, as a factor in solution of this question, may lead to one of two inferences;—and to *diametrically opposite results.*

The Theology that is based upon Cosmical Evolution and set forth by "Lux Mundi" is disposed to give a value to the Sacred Books of the East, of a character like unto, if not identical with our Sacred Scriptures.

This is a necessary sequence from the premises of Evolution. These premises, if true, must actually

abolish, or deny the fact and value of Theistic evidences in Nature, and also antagonize the necessary character of the revelation given to us in the Bible; I mean the *supernatural* element,—and, so, abolish its authority as a final revelation, and inspired of God.

But,—*another* inference may be drawn from essentially different premises.

These premises are, the necessary principle of Theistic evidences presented in Nature, and accepted by man as a fact.

By giving to Natural Theology, and to Natural Religion that place and value which reason, and the Word of God, *both*, combine to justify and to require, we can see in those Sacred Books of the East, and even in the religious ideas of the lowest grades of humanity, *some relics* of Truth which lead up to, as they proceed from a Great First-Cause.

The existing debasement, superstition, and even cruelty by which Heathendom is characterized, is thus traced to the essentially blinding and corrupting power of *Sin*,—made patent to Christians by experience, and by the Word of God; and by the fact of the overwhelming majority of mankind over whom, in their characters, and lives, it has governance and ascendency.

This brings us to the same result, and to the same principle stated by Hooker, and which I have, before, spoken of.[1]

[1]In regard to the accountability of mankind under the light of nature,—and so, of heathen nations, the following words of Hooker

This principle and inference has been lucidly presented to us in the admirable speech of Dr. Maclagan, the present Arch-Bishop of York, at the Anniversary of the Ven. S. P. G., 1897, part of which I will now quote.

"There was a time (and it is certainly well within my remembrance), when in missions to the heathen, the earliest phase was commonly destructive in its character. The missionary took his stand in the Bazaar, denounced the miserable follies of heathenism, or the superstitions of Mohammedanism, and tried to clear the ground of all those obstructions and errors, before proceeding to the positive part of his work. I believe that we have

may here be quoted. After tracing the *origin* of prevalent blindness among the heathen as to the elementary principles of "the law moral," and stating that such *might* have been known and understood, though not without *Divine help* of the natural law of understanding, he goes on to say that, men are not only responsible for ignorance of what may be *easily* known as to moral duty.

Thus, "That which we say in this case of idolatry serveth for all other things wherein the like kind of general blindness hath prevailed against the manifest Laws of Reason.

"Within the compass of which laws we do not only comprehend whatsoever may be *easily* known to belong to the duty of all men, but even whatsoever may *possibly* be known to be of that quality, so that the same be by *necessary* consequence deduced out of clear and manifest principles" (Hooker, Ecc. Pol. Book II, chapter 9). That is to say it is universally incumbent upon men to be *diligent seekers* after such knowledge of God and of duty.

Man's responsibility by reason of a *willingness* to remain ignorant of God,—or in other words *refusing to seek Him* is beautifully stated by Dr. Chalmers, Nat. Theol. Book 1, chapters 1, 2, pp. 72, 73.

learned a better way. We have come to recognize more the great principle that there is no branch of the human family in which God has left Himself, altogether without witness; that there is no race or tribe, however degraded, in which there does not still survive some little fragment of Divine truth; that the Church of Christ, although possessing that truth in its fulness, has no monopoly of it, and that there are fragments of truth, scattered here and there, even amongst the most savage and degraded nations of the world; and the discovery of these fragments of truth is the very first, and the greatest work for a Christian missionary. It is always, as we know, an easy thing to discover evil. It is far more difficult, but a far nobler thing to discover good; and the more the condition of even the most degraded tribes in the world is studied, the more we shall find and be surprised, and delighted to find these little sparks of truth, still surviving beneath the smouldering heap of superstitious fires. Of late, a good deal of attention has been given to what are called the Sacred Books of India and China. There, indeed, it is not a difficult matter to discover the survivals of noble truth, so easily, and so much to be admired, that some men have been content, or desirous almost to place such books as these on a level with our inspired Scriptures; but *that* is to *mistake altogether* the *meaning* of the discovery they have made. But it is far more difficult, in lower forms of senseless idolatry, or of sensual

worship, to discover the truth that lies hidden there. In some of these, such vestiges of truth can hardly be detected at all, and men have been so bold as to say that there are none to be found; I *absolutely disbelieve this.* I believe that wherever the image of God survives, in any human being, there will be found some little trace of that image in which he is made, and some fragment of the truth which issues from the God who gave him his being. And, I believe that a very great progress has been made in this direction, within the last half century. Men have come to see the beauty, and to recognize and enjoy the happiness of these discoveries of the truth (and I think there are few greater happinesses in the world), and have built upon them, however minute the fragment may be, the *edifice* of their mission work.

They have striven to find some common ground, however minute, with those to whom they carry the message of the Gospel;—some common ground, however limited, upon which they can stand, side by side, with those to whom they are ministering, and from which they may both look upward together to the *source* of all truth, and the *source* of all good. I believe that principles such as these are more and more influencing the work of Christian missions throughout the world, and I feel assured that just in proportion as these principles prevail, not only will our success in the mere matter of numerical increase be multiplied, but also the roots

of the mission work which we are enabled to do will be more deeply laid; and it is because of my confidence in these principles that I rejoice in what appears to me to be their *growth*." With the foregoing utterances of the Archbishop, both natural and revealed religion and all known facts in relation thereto are in perfect *accord*.

But, as I said, the *final* and authoritative solution of the question must be derived from the historical facts, and doctrinal teaching of God's Word written. To this I now proceed; and it is to be noted that the term "ignorance," as here considered, is not an *abstract*, but a Biblical phrase, and has reference to God, and to Divine things. Viewed then in connection with the historic facts and dogmatic teaching of God's Holy Word, the entrance of *sin* into the world, and the Fall of our first parents in Eden is the direct cause of the ignorance of God, wherever it is found, and wherever it is spoken of in Bible history and teaching. *This* ignorance is a *moral* quality, and relates to all man's moral nature, as his moral faculties are correlated to each other. The immediate effects of the fall were seen in Cain's fratricide; and it passed on, in its effects, from family to social and national life; and in doing so obtained cumulative force. The progress of sin is epitomized, when, before the deluge, it is recorded that "all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth," and that "the earth was corrupt *before God*, and the earth was filled with violence;" also that

"God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually" (Gen. 6:5). This is a synoptical description, upon a Theistic basis; and upon the basis of Christian experience we are justified in saying that the ignorance of God existing amongst men in these early days of the world's history was not for want of Theistic evidence, but from a depraved will and affection.

Such is a just inference from Christian experience, as well as from the Mosaic statement, and from the records of Sacred History. Further evidence is found in the fact that the Flood was a judgment sent of God upon *wilful* and *aggravated sin.*

It is put upon that basis by St. Peter, in his second Epistle. So, also, speaking of a *future* and a coming judgment upon the world, similar in its character, St. Peter says of the men of the Christian era, "*This* they *willingly* are ignorant of." This he applies to the facts of the *past*, of the *present*, and of a *declared future.* As a general principle, by all the analogy of Holy Writ, the ignorance which God charges man with, is a moral quality, as it is a wilful choice of the *Wrong*, and, in presence of evidence of the *Right.* This is the ground of God's declared anger against mankind, as set forth everywhere in the Bible; the reason for His judgments upon the Ante-Diluvians, and upon Sodom and Gomorrah. Jeremiah classes together "The heathen

that have not known Thee, and the *families* that call not on Thy Name" (Jer. 10 : 25); and so also David classes together, in like manner "The heathen that know Thee not, and the *kingdoms* that call not upon Thy Name" (Ps. 79 : 6). In both cases the just and necessary inference is that they *might* have known God, as that they *ought* to have worshiped and served Him. For the same reason, *i. e.*, a *refusal* of light, and of duty, the Amorites were cut off, as declared in Gen. 15 : 7–17. They, too, had "corrupted themselves." The same rule applies in God's recorded dealings with the Jews. As *they* lapsed into idolatry, and sinned against God, and against light, God punished them.

Following Bible Chronology, we may now consider the phraseology of Scripture in the Old and New Testaments. The Greek word ἔθνοι is the New Testament equivalent for the Hebrew word goīm, in accordance with the use of the latter word by the Jews to describe the nations by whom they were surrounded. Abraham was chosen of God, and his seed after him, from among the nations of the earth; and their separation was in accordance with a Divine purpose, as well as the subject of a Divine command. We may properly enquire what was the *purpose* of the Most High in so doing. Moses in his song refers to the "separation of the sons of Adam," and to God's "dividing to them their inheritance, according to the number of the children (Deut. 32 : 8) of Israel" (=Jacob). There was a pur-

pose of God in both cases; and we gather, from the scope of the teaching of the Old Testament, that God's purpose in connection with both the sons of Adam and the sons of Jacob was that of preserving and also disseminating a correct knowledge and a pure worship of the living and true God; and that in regard to the sons of Jacob, when God allotted to them their inheritance, His purpose did not terminate in the exclusive welfare of the Jewish people, although it conferred upon them peculiar privileges.

The passage that I have quoted suggests the fact that, as subjects of God's rule and authority, as moral governor He fixed the bounds of the several nations of the Old World, in *view* of such moral and responsible relation in which they stood to Him. The making known of God as Creator and Governor of the world, of man's sin, and of God's redemption to the world at large, as a purpose of God, is clearly set forth in Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament; specially by the Prophetical Books.

That the nations of the world, generally, were in a state of ignorance, *i. e.*, *relative* ignorance, superinduced by the reign of sin, is also a fact recognized and declared; but we are by no means justified in concluding that it was either a *necessary*, or an *absolute* ignorance.

To establish such a proposition it would be necessary to ignore or deny all primary Theistic elements, in nature, and in the Providence of God, and all revelation of Him under the Old Testament,

mediate or immediate. But, both, and all these elements, as present in evidence for God, as moral Governor deny subjective ignorance of Him to be an unavoidable necessity. Man has never sinned against God, solely for lack of knowledge of Him. The only debatable question is, as to the degree of such knowledge; and there is ample reason to conclude that among primitive races of mankind, and among non-Christian nations of the present day, such knowledge, or means thereof has been and is more than is usually supposed.

The nations of Canaan dispossessed before Abraham were not so dispossessed of God by an arbitrary exercise of His power and will, but because that after a due period of grace and trial, under a measure of light and knowledge sufficient to determine their character, as free agents, He visited them with such exercise of His righteous authority over them.

After much favor and long-suffering, His action with the Jews, was of a similar character; our Lord warned them of it when He said, "The Kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof" (Matt. 21:43).

We, as Gentiles, are given to understand that His action with us will be of a similar character. "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, *until the times of the Gentiles shall be fulfilled.*" Again: "Blindness, in part, is happened to Israel

until the fulness of the Gentiles is come in." With these established conclusions, as to the united testimony of the Law and the Prophets, and the writers of the New Testament; from an *a posteriori* point of view we can arrive at a sure and certain knowledge of the *cause* of the ignorance spoken of, and as it applies to non-Christian, non-Theistic, or Heathen Nations. This is not only the logical inference from established facts and demonstrated truths, but by positive and dogmatic statements of Holy Writ, and by the incidental allusions therein to Sacred History of the Old Testament that the result of such moral ignorance, everywhere, and at all times is traced to its true cause, in the earliest history of mankind, as given in the Book of Genesis, and as referred to in the inspired testimony of the Apostle Paul, that "By one man sin entered into the World, and death by sin; and, so, death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned" (Romans 5: 12). As this truth underlies all of the New Testament both historically, doctrinally, and practically, and unites it with the Old Testament, by a converging testimony, it makes the Bible to be, essentially, one Book; and in its several parts, absolutely inseparable from each other. As man *may be*, and very many *are* ignorant of God, although surrounded by available light, in this New Testament era; as such ignorance is either a willing or a wilful ignorance, *now;* so has it *ever been* since our first parents fell from God, and from holiness.

"God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions" (Eccles. 7 : 29).

As Moses, in his Song, said of Israel, "They have corrupted themselves" (Deut. 32 : 5); so does he say, in the Book of Genesis, chapter 6 : 12, "All flesh had corrupted his way on the Earth;" and (verse 5), "every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." We are justified, from all the evidence, in saying that man does not, and that he never did sin, simply from want of the means of knowledge of both truth and duty, *i. e.*, from want of *essential* knowledge.

The darkness that now does, and did aforetime cover the Earth, and gross darkness the people, is due to the nature and deadly character of sin, and the effects of the Fall of Adam. *Hence* this widespread ignorance and the "many inventions" which Sin has produced and Satan has fostered.

The means of elementary knowledge of God, and of Right; what was essential for man to know, as a responsible being, in order to the formation of a righteous character, here, and to future salvation, hereafter; *this*, God has, at all times, secured to him as a *responsible* possession.

If this was essentially necessary *to man* as a moral agent, and destined for a future life, it was no less necessary to God, AS GOD and, as Moral Lawgiver; and *this*, I say, He has, always, fully secured.

When man departed from God, in Eden, and

suffered the penalty of his sin; as He *admonished* him, afterwards, in the dispersion, at Babel, and still more solemnly by the judgment of the Flood; *after the Flood*, when He chose Abram and separated him from the rest of mankind, such choice was inclusive of a similar purpose of consolidating, securing and disseminating throughout the World, to all Nations of men a sufficient and a culminatory degree of knowledge of Himself: which light, and knowledge, man when he fell put from him; and we are justified in concluding, from *a posteriori* evidence, that it was *because* of this rejection, that it became a *special design*, in the order of God's moral government, to set apart a Nation and a People, by whom, as *depositaries* of His revealed will, such light and knowledge should be *preserved uncorrupted* in the Earth and should, also, by them be, at least, indirectly disseminated, as, from them it should be available, as cumulative evidence to all who should "diligently seek Him."

I would now draw attention to the fact that in Scripture phraseology the word "Heathen"[1] is at

[1] It may here be noticed that throughout the Book of Psalms the phrase "heathen" is used as a convertible term with "the ungodly," or profane person, and as descriptive of those who wilfully transgress against knowledge; and also of those who are malignantly disposed towards God and His people. Thus: "Thou hast rebuked the *heathen*. Thou hast destroyed the *wicked* or *ungodly*. Thou hast put out their name forever and ever" (Ps. 9. 5). With this compare verses 15, 16, 17,—where the *parallelism* which I have referred to is very marked.

least very frequently to be regarded as a synonym for a profane, or ungodly person, or for those who offend of "malicious wickedness"; that is to say have *wilfully departed from God.*

A sufficient illustration of this may be found in the Book of Psalms; from which I will quote a few passages. In Psalms 8 and 9 the words "heathen," "ungodly," "wicked"—"*man*" (used generically, referring to him as fallen from God) and "man of the Earth," are used as *synonyms.* So of Psalms 10, 11, and 12, in their general scope and import deal with the fact of prevalent ungodliness as *opposing*, and *opposed* to "a remnant" who are "witnesses" for God. There is a clear inference to be drawn from Psalm 81 : 9. "Hear, O my people, and I will assure thee, O Israel; if thou wilt *hearken* unto Me, there shall be no strange god with thee, neither shalt thou worship any other god."

The facts are clearly stated in Ezekiel 20 : 32, where he says to the Jews "That which cometh into your minds shall not be at all. We will be as the *heathen*, as the families of the countries to serve wood and stone."

In Jeremiah 44 it is recorded that they defiantly refused to obey God's answer to their deceit-

So of Psalm 82, at large; specially verse 5, "They *will not* be learned, nor understand, but walk on still in darkness: all the foundations of the earth are out of course."

Psalm 83 is similar in its character and testimony.

ful inquiry. For this reason, God gave them up to follow their own imagination, and to be punished accordingly.

For a similar reason God declares that He will sit in judgment, finally, on the nations in the Valley of Jehoshaphat, where He will "sit to judge the heathen round about" (Joel 3 : 12). St. Paul says in Rom. 1 : 12, that the heathen, at that day, knew God, but glorified Him not, as God,—neither were thankful. Also, that they did not like to retain God in their knowledge; therefore, God gave them up to vile affections. Our Lord's personal teaching is similar in character. "*Why* do ye not understand My speech? Even because ye cannot hear My word."

Again: "I thank Thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes."

Amplification of these statements is not necessary.

There is a cumulative power in Gospel truth to produce judicial blindness in those who *continue to sin against it.*

It is no less certainly true that a similar result will ensue to those who, although they are much less privileged than those to whom Christian light is available,—yet, either neglect, or refuse to follow that *lesser light.* That God will deal with men according to degrees of light, we are not left to *infer.* We are plainly told so by our Lord Jesus Christ.

We are fortified, from all the facts, in saying that God's moral government, and the nature of moral ignorance of God is one in character in all ages, and under all circumstances. *Degrees* of evidence do not affect that character, nor do such degrees affect the moral result. We are justified, however, in believing that native and inherent dislike of the supernatural (which is, indeed, dislike of the Divine character), while always present in fallen man, will and does *increase*, under the light of Christianity, in the case of the *disobedient*. "There is a woe pronounced against those who are wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight" (Isaiah 5:21). So, also, God has declared that He has "made foolish the wisdom of this world" (1 Cor. 1:20). The "ignorance" of the *majority*, not merely of the heathen is due to the *determinate will* of the individual sinner, to the character of sin, itself, and, also, to the cumulative power of sin, in communities and nations of the world; but, such gathering of the cumulative power of sin, is met of God by counter influences, as He sees meet; and with special power under the Gospel of Christ, and the dispensation of the Holy Ghost.

"When the enemy shall come in like a flood, the spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him" (Is. 59:19).

To be followed by

Theism Under Supernatural Law

Table of Contents

I. Sources of Sacred History, Ante and Post Diluvial.

II. The Office of the Church; A Witness and Keeper of Holy Writ.

III. Theism as a Cumulative Force.

IV. Inspiration as a Consolidating and Theistic Force.

V. Development of the Supernatural under an Inspired Law-Giver and Leader.

VI. Personality and Authority of Moses, and His Relation to the Pentateuch.

VII. Combinations of Theism.
- A. Objective, and as related to the Books of Scripture.
- B. Subjective Oneness, as the work of one Holy Spirit.

VIII. Theism in its Developments as Related to Moral Accountability.

IX. Sources of Objective Knowledge of God, as Related to Philosophy and Critical Science.

X. Sources of Subjective Knowledge of God, as Related to Free-Agency on Theistic Premises.

XI. Prophets and Prophecy as Related to Christ: "That Prophet!" Ministers of the New Testament as Related to Christ.

XII. The Inscrutability of God; Limitations of Theism. A. Objective; B. Subjective.

XIII. The Person and Prophetic Office of Christ. (*a*) As Related to His Divinity; Prophecy and History Unified. (*b*) As Related to His Humanity. 1. A Perfect, 2. A Sinless Humanity. (*c*) Doctrine of the Kenosis. Perversions of "Lux Mundi."

XIII. Note (*d*) Cumulative Power of Christ's Testimony to Holy Scripture.
   1. From His Perfect Humanity.
   2. From His Prophetic Office.
   3. From the Hypostatic Union of the Two Natures.

XIV. The Incarnation as Related to Theism. Neg. The Hypothesis of Lux Mundi, as to the Incarnation, as a Theological basis. Pos. Place of the Incarnation in Holy Scripture.

XV. Relation of Christ as Prophet to Holy Scripture.

XVI. (*a*) The Atonement as Related to Biblical Theism. (*b*) The Intercession of Christ; Christ as High Priest and Mediator. (*c*) Lux Mundi on the Atonement. (*d*) The Atonement as Related to Higher Created Intelligences.

XVII. The Miracles of Christ in their Relation to Christianity, and to Christian Theism.

XVIII. Christ as King. (*a*) The Kingship of Christ, and the Millennial Reign. (*b*) Christ as Judge and Universal King.

XIX. The Law of Conscience as Related to the Revealed Supernatural and to the Christ of History.

APPENDIX.

Flint's Theism Examined.

BL
200
.S68

Softley, Ed
Theism un
Law. 227

NOV 5
S. I. Semi
200 .S

BL
200
.S68

Softley
Theism under
Natural Law.
227410

S. I. Seminar Room

ural

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
44 758 192

227410